PRODROMUS,

OR THE

Character

OF

Mr. *SHERLOCK'S*

BOOK:

CALLED

A Diſcourſe of the Knowledg of Jeſus Chriſt.

IN WHICH,

The Evil *Spirit*, and *Deſign*, of that Book is Diſcovered, and ſeveral *Errours* therein, Confuted.

Written to Mr. *Sh.* himſelf, by *S. Rolls*.

London, Printed for the Author. 1674.

Awak from sin
with out delay Thomas
bear light your peer
and keep a study h...

David ~~Bock~~

12345678
432

24691356
37036937
91827712

13133118 96

David Richaar
Thomas D.

SIR,

HOw great a love, and value, I have for your good Father, and Mother, I have declared to ſeveral of their Friends, and mine; as alſo, that I have had conſiderable reſpects and kindneſs, for your ſelf, becauſe I have heard you Preach well, and did never obſerve you to live ill, ſave that I never thought you ſo humble, and ſelf-abaſing as ſome other good men are; but rather that the height of your mind, and ſpirit, did bear ſome proprtion to that of your body, which (without diſparagement to that part of you) is taller by head, and ſhoulders, than many other mens.

I am abundantly confirm'd in the opinion which I did long ſince conceive, as touching your defectiveneſs in point of humility, (and that you were but a meer dwarfe in that grace) by the peeviſh, contentious Book which you have lately written, quarrelling with your betters moſt ſhamefully, without any juſt cauſe given on their parts, and ſetting your ſelf againſt ſeven men at once, (moſt of them old enough to have been your Fathers, if not ſome of them your Grandfathers) whereby you have, or may make the work as merry, as did a certain

Bookſeller, when time was, by Titling one of his Books, *J. G. againſt ſeven men.*

1. It will be no hard matter for me to give the world an account what hath induced, and provoked me to write againſt your Book, wherewith you have greatly diſpleaſed both Foes, and Friends, Orthodox Conformiſts, as well as Non conformiſts; the Church of *England* (or a great part of that body) as well as other Churches.

Firſt, The *Crambe*, or Coleworts, which you have given us boil'd, it may be an hundred times over, *viz.* that wicked Irony (for ſo you bring it in) *Acquaintance with Chriſt, Acquainted with the Perſon of Chriſt, One that is acquainted with Chriſts Perſon, One of Jeſus Chriſt's Acquaintances, and Familiars; This it is to be acquainted with Jeſus Chriſt's Perſon, and this we learn by acquaintance with the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt*, &c. I ſay thoſe *Coleworts*, which you have boiled ſo often over, and over (for I meet with thoſe kind of expreſſions, no leſs than two and forty times, in the hundred forty firſt pages of your Book-) have ſo nauſeated me, and made me ſo very ſick of you, and your book, that I could not chuſe but bring 'um up again (I had almoſt ſaid in your very face.)

Give me leave to tell you (young man) 'tis ill jeſting with ſuch edge-tools, as is the ſacred expreſſion, and notion, of *Acquaintance with Chriſt*; yea and with the *Perſon* of Chriſt: for certainly there is ſuch a thing, and woe be to you if you live, and die without it.

Whilſt you falſly accuſe (for ſo you do) the grave Doctors, and Miniſters, whom you write a-

gainſt

gainſt, of rejecting Acquaintance with the Goſpel, and Laws of Chriſt, whilſt they pretend Acquaintance with his *Perſon*, you do perfectly laugh to ſcorn Acquaintance with the *Perſon* of our Saviour, that you may render acquaintaace with his *Laws*, and *Goſpel* to be all in all, which I ſhall hereafter prove to be a very great miſtake, and a very dangerous Error.

Sir, They joyn thoſe things together which God hath joyned, *viz.* Acquaintance with Chriſt his *Perſon*, and his *Goſpel* both; I ſay both with his *Laws* and with his *Perſon*, 'tis you that part them aſſunder, whilſt you (I had almoſt ſaid *blaſphemouſly*) deride acquaintance with the *Perſon* of Chriſt. In ſo doing, you have fixt a *nigrum theta* upon your ſelf that will never be worn out, *&c.*

You have perverted and miſrepreſented many great and excellent Doctrines, as namely thoſe of *Union*, and *Communion* with Chriſt, and of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt being imputed to Believers, (which a very *Jew* could not contemn'd at a higher rate than you have done) you have poiſon'd that great *Fountain*, *viz.* the Doctrine of Juſtification by Faith, and not by Works, debauching that which *Luther* calls *Stantis vel cadentis Eccleſiæ articulum* (for ſo he calls the great Doctrine of Juſtification.)

You have given away the better halfe of the *Proteſtant* Religion, in contending for Juſtification by our own works (which Doctrine is the very ſoul of Popery): and were I gone ſo far towards Popery as that comes to, I think I were in danger to be theirs intirely; for I had as lief yield to all

things elſe which the Papiſts either ſay or do, as to this one damnable Doctrine (which is the very Rats-bane of all Popery) *viz.* that Juſtification is not (as Proteſtant Divines aſſert it to be) by the righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt imputed to us, and applyed by Faith, but by our own works in conformity (though not to the Ceremonial, yet) to the Moral Law.

You have ſometimes brought in whole ſides of Practical Divinity, (as ſound as could be Preach'd, and back'd it with pertinent texts of Scripture, and then abus'd it all when you had done.

You have ſought for (*nodum in ſcirpo*) *knots in Bulruſhes*, ever and anon, and pickt holes in mens coats when one could not imagine either before, or after the reading of your book, how there could be any colour, or pretext for ſo doing.

Juſt as now and then we have ſeen a quarrelſome Boy juſtling a civil Lad that went by him peaceably and gave him no affront, and giving him ſome ugly name, that he might provoke him to fight with him, or elſe go for a meer Coward: I ſay juſt ſo have you done by theſe reverend Miniſters, whom you write againſt: witneſs the peeviſheſt thing that ever was ſaid; *viz.* when Dr. *Jacomb* had ſaid that for men to ſin, and never repent after it, was a ſure evidence of a carnal eſtate: you moſt impertinently reply upon him, *as if every man that did ſin did repent.* If you do not anſwer him *ad idem*, you do not contradict him; if you do, (that is, if you mean repent with a repentance never to be repented of) you do thereby inſinuate a moſt notorious falſhood, *viz.* That all men have been, and

ſhall

ſhall be ſaved: for if all men have, and ſhall truly repent of their ſins, that will follow; for Repentance and Remiſſion of ſins, Remiſſion of ſins and eternal life (or an entrance into that life) always go together.

Your words are, *page* 375. „ What bad man is „ there who does not at one time, or other repent of „ his ſins, and complain of them? and *p.* 376. There „ are no men but do at one time or other, expreſs „ ſome ſorrow for their ſins, (which he calls Repentance).

Moreover, *Sir*, If Dr. *J.* by *ſenſe of ſin*, and *after Repentance*, had meant no more but ſorrow, or expreſſions of ſorrow for ſin (which is more than you can evince, though you preſume he meant no more) let me tell you, it is notoriouſly falſe that every bad man doth in that ſenſe repent: Witneſs, *Jer.* 8. 6. *No man repented him of his wickedneſs, ſaying, what have I done?* Now whether ſhall we believe the Prophet *Jer.* that ſaid *no man* (*viz.* in that time and place) *repented him of his wickedneſs*; or you that ſay every man doth, at one time or other? Alſo in *Jer.* 6. 15. we thus read, *Were they aſhamed when they committed abomination, yea they were not aſhamed, neither did they bluſh.* Have they any ſenſe or feeling of ſin whoſe *Conſciences* are ſaid to be *ſeared with a hot Iron?* 1 Tim. 4. 2. What is the effect of *ſearing*, but the taking away of ſenſe and feeling? A learned man tranſlates the words, *Quorum conſcientia cauterio reſecta eſt*, whoſe conſciences are cut off by ſearing; *viz.* as rotten members are ſometimes ſeared off with a hot Iron, *&c.*

When may we expect expreſſions of ſorrow,

and remorſe from men, if not when they know themſelves to be dying, and are perfectly in their wits? yet we read of no ſuch thing from one of thoſe Thieves which was Crucified at the ſame time with our Saviour: yea the text ſaith, *Luke* 23, 39, 40, 41. that *one of the Malefactors which were hang'd, rail'd on Chriſt, ſaying, If thou be Chriſt, ſave thy ſelf, and us*, &c. yea this he did though the other Thief rebuk'd him, *ſaying, Doſt thou not fear God, ſeeing thou art in the ſame condemnation? and we indeed juſtly*, &c. I ſay neither the greatneſs of his ſin, nor the pious admonition of his fellow ſufferer, nor the aſſurance he had (which ſick men ordinarily have not) that he ſhould certainly die within a very few hours, nor yet the preſence of Chriſt hanging upon the Croſs, whoſe Crucifixion was attended with many remarkable circumſtances; I ſay, none of all theſe, brought that Thief to the leaſt ſorrow for, or ſenſe of ſin: which inſtance alone (if your pen had not been in full carrear to write ſomething in contradiction to Dr. *Jacomb*) might have eaſily ſtopt you, from making a fault where you really found none.

'Tis one of your *Peccadillo's*, or one of the motes in your eye, to deride all *Similitudes*, though the Holy Ghoſt is pleaſed to abound therewith in the holy Scriptures; witneſs *Mat.* 13. when beſides the Parable of the *Sower* and the *Seed*, the Kingdom of Heaven is compared to *Muſtardſeed*, v. 25. to *Leaven*, v. 33. to *hidden Treaſure*, v. 44. to the *Pearl of Price*, v. 45. to a *Drawn net caſt into the Sea*, v. 47. Had ſome body elſe compared the Kingdome of God, or any thing elſe to ſix or ſeven things, in one breath

breath as it were, he must needs have been answered with a long harang about *Don-quixot and the Windmills* 'Tis a fault which you never pardon in a similitude if it do not run on all four, though you know the Proverb, *similitudo non currit quatuor pedibus*; and you may as well quarrel a Man for not having four leggs (as a Horse hath) as a similitude (to which it do's not belong so to do,) for not running (as they say) upon all four. Do any of our Saviours Parables, or Similitudes do so? Did it every way *quadrare*, and strictly accord, when Christ said of himself, that he came *as a Thief in the Night?* You seem to have forgotten a known Maxim in *Stahlius*, p. 569. of the *London* Edition. *Ad veritatem propositionis*, &c. that, *It is not required to the truth of a Proposition that the Predicate should agree to the Subject, according to every thing that is signified, or implied in the Subject, but it sufficeth, if it agree to it according to some one thing that is imported.* Ex gr. Christ saith, *Before* Abraham *was, I am, which doth not agree to Christ according to his Humane Nature* (for he sprang from *Abraham* according to the flesh) but only according to his Divine.

You seem to think that similitudes do *darken* things, whereas every body knows that they are brought to Illustrate; Yea, our Saviour intimates as much, *John* 3. 12. *If I have told you Earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall you believe if I tell you of Heavenly things?* that is, if you cannot understand Heavenly things by and with similitudes, taken from Earthly, much less without them.

Were all your Book ſuch as ſome paſſages in it, I mean ſo bad ſenſe, I ſhould think you as great an Enemy to *Senſe*, as you pretend your ſelf a Friend to *Reaſon*. There was an Old Gentleman who had he been now alive, would have call'd it the *Firſt born of Non-ſenſe*, to ſay that the principal ſignification of the word *Chriſt* is an *Office*; what an anointed Office? Is a King the Kingly Office? Or a Prieſt the Prieſtly Office? Or thoſe Offices are they Kings and Prieſts? I thought that *Sacerdotium* and ſo the name of every Office had been a Noun Subſtantive, but Chriſt or anointed is a Noun Adjective. You had as good have broken *Priſcian*'s Head, or made falſe *poſition* in a Verſe, as have confounded *Abſtracts*, and *Concretes*, and made that *Non-ſenſe* in the *Abſtract*, which was very good ſenſe in the *Concrete*; and miſtook a Noun *Adjective* (for ſo is the Name of Chriſt) for a Noun *Subſtantive*, for ſo is the Name of every Office, as *Sacerdotium*, the *Prieſt-hood*, &c. Say *Prieſt-hood*, and I know what you mean, without your joyning any other word to it; but if you ſay *Anointed*, I cannot tell who, or what you would ſpeak of, whether *Perſon*, or *thing*; whether the Feet of Chriſt which *Mary* anointed, *Luk.* 7. or the Eyes of the Blind, which Chriſt is ſaid to have anointed with ſpittle, *&c. John* 9. or the anointed Wafers ſpoken of, *Exod.* 29. 2. or the Altar which we read was anointed, *Numb.* 7. 1. Or if I ſhould ſuppoſe it was a *Perſon* that you did intend by that Name, a Perſon inveſted with ſome Sacred Office, how know I whether you mean one that is anointed a King, or a Prieſt, or a Prophet, but

but one, or but two, or all three of theſe? I ſay from the word *anointed*, ſtanding by its ſelf, your meaning cannot be known; though by the context and coherence when we read a Chapter in the Book we knew that by Chriſt is meant our Saviour. I mean his Perſon, who was annointed to ſuch and ſuch Offices, not the *Offices* to which he was anointed. Having taken you thus tardy, both in *Grammar*, and *Senſe*, let me advise you for avoiding the like inconvenience, in another Book of yours, *to ſtay at* Jericho *till your beard be grown* and then (and not till then) write again. Since I have heard you alwayes Preach good Senſe, I wonder to find you *Printing* perfect and incurable Non-ſenſe. If you be infallible in *Cathedra* (as the Pope is ſaid to be,) and that *Cathedra* or Chair be your *Pulpit*, I am ſure you are as liable to erre in the *Preſs*, as any other man. Taking *N. C.* (as you do) to be prone to *Non-ſenſe*, I wonder you would venture *to halt before ſuch ſuppoſed Cripples*; eſpecially having provoked them to watch for your halting. If any body have occaſion for two or three Doſes more of *Non-ſenſe*, I think I can ſupply them out of your Book, but thoſe I keep as a reſerve; *Too much of one thing* (eſpecially at one time) *is good for nothing*.

The reſt will *keep cold*, and I ſhall ſerve it up in convenient time for their ſatisfaction who may long for it.

I proceed in the charge which I am to exhibit againſt you; and verily the particulars are ſo many, and ſo groſs, that (if there were ſuch

a thing as *Accumulative Treaſon*) all put together would amount to that, yea even to *High Treaſon* againſt the King of Kings.

To make this good my next accuſation ſhall be, that you have gone about to undermine the Kingdome of Chriſt in this part of the world, by attempting to make the worthy, and holy Writings of ſeveral of his Ambaſſadors uſeleſs, and of no effect, for that you know will be the natural effect of bringing them, and their books into contempt. Poſſibly hundreds of ſouls have cauſe to bleſs God for thoſe uſeful books of Mr. *Shepheards, viz.* his *Sincere Convert*, and *Sound Believer*, (to which, as to all humane writings, ſome grains muſt be allowed) which you ſo expoſe, that if men would take your word, they would never be read more: Pray Sir don't you ſpoil, (I mean as to their eſteem) better books, than ever you are like to make.

To me it ſounds like a very unchriſtian, yea barbarous, and inhumane thing, to diſturb the ghoſts of dead men, rake in their aſhes, and not ſuffer them to reſt quietly in their graves (where 'tis ſaid *the weary are at reſt.*) Thus have you dealt by two Reverend Miniſters, *viz.* Mr. *Shepheard* and Mr. *Bridges*, who were long ſince amongſt *the ſouls of Juſt men made perfect*, (as we uſe to ſpeak who never dream'd of the ſoul's ſleeping after death) *&c.* 'Tis abominable to vilifie thoſe on earth whom God is glorifying in heaven: If that Rule, *De mortuis nil niſi bene*, be not obſerv'd, who can be ſafe?

It became not the pious Education which was given

given you, by godly, and wiſe Parents, lovers of ſuch men as you have ſcorn'd, nor one that had profeſs'd ſuch inclinations as you did, leſs than ten years agoe, to write againſt two Divines of ſuch eminency, as were Mr. *Sh.* and *W. B.* but it was neceſſary for you to ſhew your manly courage in venturing upon two dead Lyons, which becauſe dead, were leſs formidable than one living Dog, for *mortui non mordent*, and you ſhould remember, *nec morderi debent*; eſpecially as your *dentes canini* (for ſuch you know every man has in his head) uſe to do, till they *meet* again.

Shall we reckon now (as good now as another time) about the *Septemvirate*, or ſeven men which you have taken to task? *viz.* Dr. *Owen*, Dr. *Jacomb*, Mr. *Shepheard*, Mr. *Watſon*, Mr. *Bridge*, Mr. *Brookes*, and Mr. *Thomas Vincent*: whilſt they ſay, *Ne Hercules contra duos*, *Hercules* would not encounter two at once, you ſtep forth and ſay, but you will encounter ſeven. Had they been the ſeven wiſe men of *Greece* it had been all one to you, ſo are you made like *Leviathan without fear.* To count the names backward to what I did before, begin we with Mr. *Vincent*, and Mr. *Brooks*, take them two in all their circumſtances, and believe me they are far above the juſt contempt of your ſelf, or of any man elſe. Mr. *W. Bridge* (who comes next to hand) was when Fellow of *Emanuel* Colledg (where no Fools or Dunces uſe to be Fellows) famous for his Piety, Parts, and Learning before you were born; and if the hedge of Reverence

to-

towards aged Perſons ſhould be broken down by ſuch as you are, woe be to us all, if we live to be old.

Ask thoſe who liv'd in the *Low Countreys*, about the ſame time with them, whether Mr. *W. Bridge* was not famous there for his Piety, and Parts, though Mr. *Jeremy Burroughs* and he were joyn'd in the care of the ſame Congregation; which Mr. *Burroughs* aforeſaid was certainly one of the moſt rational, and profitable Preachers, and Writers, that ever was in the world; witneſs his book of *Contentment*, his *Moſes his Choice*, and *Ironicum*, &c. Had Mr. *Bridges* been then a mean parted man, he had ſhone no more where Mr. *B.* appeared than the Stars do when the Sun ſhineth forth in his might and brightneſs; but I aſſure you he was there as another Sun in that Firmament.

True it is (which we may ſay now that he is dead) he did uſe to Preach now, and then, in *Clapham* (your then Curacy) (*& hinc illæ Lachrymæ*) which I ſuppoſe did incenſe you; and ſome body was ſo unwiſe, as to put out ſome haſty notes of his, very crudely, and thence you, and others have taken advantage againſt him: But God grant that you your ſelf may ever whilſt you live, become ſo good, and great a man as Mr. *Bridges* was, when he was himſelf, and at his beſt. As for Mr. *Watſon*, who that knows him, knows him not to be an humble, harmleſs, holy man? a Painful, Practical, Orthodox, and Profitable Preacher? whoſe Labours are well accepted of by his hearers; a wholſome ſpiritual Writer,

Writer, and if it be ſaid, that in his Books and Sermons, there are now and then ſome things which you count too *little*, or too *ſmall*, I could tell you of a far greater man than ever you are like to be (both for his Dignity in the Church, as alſo for his Learning) in whoſe Printed Sermons there are ten ſuch *petite* paſſages (as you reckon them, for every body does not call 'um ſo) to his one; yet his Sermons have been almoſt adored by ſome, whilſt for the tithe of his Spangles (if I may ſo call them) Mr. *Watſons* are unjuſtly ſcorned. The worſt book that ever he wrote will (I believe) afford him more comfort upon his death bed, than ever yours, which I am writing againſt, will afford you. As for his very good gift in Prayer, it is well known to them that are acquainted with him, (and how many are there who ſay that Prayer is the duty, of duties, the main exerciſe of a Chriſtian? and a very great duty it is indeed;) now that there is ſuch a thing as a gift in Prayer, I ſhall refer you (if you have any doubt concerning it) to the late *Biſhop* of *Cheſter* his excellent diſcourſe upon that ſubject; which if you miſlike (as I would hope you do not) you can reckon with him for it though he be dead, as you have done with others, and make him do penance in one of your white ſheets, &c. So that all things conſidered, Mr. *Watſon* ſeems to be an object of Mr. *Sherlocks envy*, rather than of his *contempt*; for beſides the great intereſt which he has in the hearts of good underſtanding People (in ſpight of all the vain attempts which have been made

to

to ruin his Reputation,) I ſay, beſides that who that has read Mr. *Watſon's* Book and Mr. *Sherlock's*, had not rather according to the beſt judgment that can be made from thoſe Books either of the frame of their Spirits, or of their ſoundneſs in the Faith, I ſay, who had not much rather dye in Mr. *Watſon's*, than in Mr. *Sherlock's* preſent condition?

The next Antagoniſt of yours (or rather the next to whom you have made your ſelf an Antagoniſt) is Reverend and holy Mr. *Shepheard* ὁ μακαρίτης. Though he be gotten into the beſt of Sanctuaries, and died long ſince there lay hold upon the Horns of the Altar (of which all other Altars were but types and ſhadows,) yet will you go about to pluck him thence. He wrote four good Books to my knowledge, one of *the Sabbath*, *the ſound Believer*, *the ſincere Convert*, and *of being Heavenly in Earthly Imployments*: Thoſe were all good works, for which of them would you ſtone him, if you could come at him? Know, Young Man, know (for I have no patience with you at this turn) that the Name and Memory of Mr. *Shepheard* will live, and be as a precious ointment, when yours (if God do not give you grace to Repent of that vile and wicked Book, which you have written (for ſo a very grave and Learned Divine of the Church of *England* was pleaſed to call it,) I ſay when your Name will be caſt out as unſavoury Salt, and ſtink in the Noſtrils of all good People. The five forementioned being ſuppoſed by you not to be your full match, you have Challenged, or

provok'd

provok'd two more, *viz.* Doctor *Jacomb*, and Doctor *Owen*. As for Doctor *Jacomb*, I well remember him in *Trinity* Colledge five and twenty years ago (about which time I was a Fellow there my self) in high Repute for his good Life, good Learning, and excellent Gravity; greatly belov'd of the then Master (who lov'd an honest Man, and a good Scholar with all his heart.) He has been for (I believe) Twenty years past a *London* Minister (either ἐν τῷ φανερῷ, or ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ,) and alwayes in very great esteem for his Piety, Parts, Prudence, Sound, Judicious, Practical, Spiritual, Substantial Preaching. His Hearers are as well able to judge of good Divinity as most Men's are, and would never have continued with him if he had not continued to Preach such to them. But you represent him the prittiest non-sensical, trifling Goose-cap, one of them that ever set Pen to Paper; for your injustice in so doing I shall deal roundly with you, when I come to treat of *Union with Christ*, under which head you fall foul upon Doctor *Jacomb*; your self indeed writing concerning that matter, as one that knows not what he saith, or whereof he doth affirm. But had you the confidence, over and above the six fore-mentioned, to enter the Lists with Doctor *Owen*? Whose Parts and Learning are so well known, not only in *England*, but in Foreign parts, that for you to Challenge him as you do with *idle talk*, and *meer tittle tattle* (which in a more Masculine and less *Billingsgate* Expression, is errand Non-sense.) was so to trifle, and so to shew your Teeth where you could

not

not bite, as little Doggs do, which tire themſelves with barking againſt the Moon. Love (as they ſay) *Deſcends*, but an abuſive ſpirit, which is the fruit of hatred, loves to *aſcend*, and the higher it climbs, or the more excellent the Perſon is whom it faſteneth upon, the more it prides, and ſolaceth it ſelf. Therefore was Dr. *Owen* as fit a perſon as could be for you to write againſt, who had an ambition to ride over the heads of thoſe you call Diſſentors, (who *like the Fox*, I think, *the more they are curſt, the more they thrive*) and whoſe Fame, like the Palm-tree, *ſuppreſſa reſurgit*; the more you ſtir the troubled and troubleſome waters of your paſſion againſt them, the more your ſelf ſtinks; but they like ſweet Spices, the more you beat, and pound them, the more they ſend forth a ſweet ſavour, and the greater is their fragrancy.

And now (Sir) being perſwaded, that you have ſwallowed the ſeven Champions aforeſaid at one morſel (by the help of a good imagination, or conceipt of your own) and find a ſharp appetite for ſome more, let me adviſe you the next time to ſatisfie your hunger with Mr. *Jenkins upon Jude*, Dr. *Bates* his new book in *Quarto*, Mr. *Anthony Burges* his Works, and Mr. *Vines* his Writings, Mr. *Caryll* upon *Job*, Mr. *Gale* his Court of the *Gentiles*, Mr. *Samuel Leigh* of *Newington*, his learned Tracts, Mr. *Cawdry* his book on the Sabbath, Mr. *How* of the bleſſedneſs of the Righteous, and Mr. *Janes his Scholaſtical and Practical Divinity*; I ſay, feed upon all theſe till you have turned them *in ſuccum*,

ſuccum, & ſanguinem, that is, (according to your way of digeſting good books) into foolery and non-ſenſe; and when you have ſo done, then have at St. *Auguſtine*, and St. *Chryſoſtome*, St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Hierom*, St. *Bernard*, and all the reſt of the Fathers: For no man but your ſelf, and thoſe that ſpeak the ſame things as your ſelf do, could ever yet ſpeak, or write ſenſe. I am ſure there are many paſſages in St. *Auguſtine* that are very obnoxious to your cenſure.

Then come nearer home, and write againſt *the Articles of the Church of* England, expreſly, and with open face, as you have done in this Book againſt ſome of them, more clancularly, and leſs diſcernedly, or rather leſs *profeſſedly*. Was not *Iſmael* a brave Fellow (and who would not be like him?) *Whoſe hand was lifted up againſt every man, and every mans hand againſt him?* Methinks I hear you concerning the *N. C.* ſpeaking as *Pharaoh* did concerning the *Iſraelites*, *Ex.* 15. 9. *I will purſue, I will over-take, I will divide the Spoil, my Luſt ſhall be ſatisfied upon them, I will draw my Sword, my hand ſhall deſtroy them.* But may not the Almighty blow upon you with his Wind, and cauſe a Sea of horrour, and miſery to cover you e're you are aware? and your ſelf to ſink *like lead in the mighty Waters*, though now you ſwim like Oil, or Cork upon the top of all Waters? *Be not high minded, but fear.*

The Spirit which breathes throughout your Book, which to my thinking is very unlike that meek Spirit who deſcended in the form of a Dove, and that wiſdom from above, which St.

James ſpeaks of, *Jam.* 1. 17. which is *pure*, *peaceable*, &c. and ſo like that Wiſdom which he ſaith deſcendeth not from above, but is *Earthly*, *Senſual*, *Deviliſh*; I ſay the evil Spirit which breathes in the greateſt part of your Book, has provoked me to write againſt it, for if *where envying, and ſtrife is, there is confuſion, and every evil work*, (*Jam.* 1. 16.) then in your Book is Confuſion, and every evil work; and what may we ſuppoſe to be in the Author, mean time? I dare ſay your Book is more incorporated, and impregnated in moſt parts of it with *Pride*, *Envy*, and ſpight, than *Epſom*, or *Tunbridge*-Waters are with thoſe wholeſom Minerals, from whence they receive their Virtue. I had almoſt call'd your Book *the Picture of Envy*, for ſo it is: who would have thought that the mild Gentleman in the Preface ſhould have prov'd ſuch a Tiger in the Book? That he who *came in like a Lamb*, *ſhould have gone out like a Lyon?* I'le ne're truſt *Preface* more for your ſake; There may be good Corn in the mouth of the Sack, and the reſt ſtark naught: Yet I dare not but ſay that there are many excellent paſſages in your Book, but they are ſuch as you bring to abuſe, and deride; witneſs p. 139, and 240. So there were many good People in *Smith-field* in Queen *Mary*'s dayes, but they were brought thither to be burn'd. One told his Friend who had wrote a ſmall contraverſial diſcourſe, that there were ſome things in it which he did like very well, that was, the objections of other men, which he quoted to anſwer, but had not anſwered them; So

ſay

ſay I to you, Sir, moſt of the paſſages which you object againſt, I like very well: It ſhould ſeem your poyſon is my meat, *and after the way that you call Hereſie ſo Worſhip I the God of my Fathers.*

If you had written your Preface before your Book, you had not done ſo ill, for though you did fail of your promiſe (for then it would have been in the nature of a Promiſe) *viz.* to have carefully avoided all reflections, yet your ſincere purpoſe to have ſo done (when you were not conſcious to your ſelf you ſhould not accompliſh,) might have pleaded your excuſe in part: but after that you had reflected, gib'd, and jear'd almoſt in every Page, moſt petulantly, and ſometimes profanely, to tell the World that you had carefully avoided all perſonal reflections; and had given no hard words, ſhews, as, how little *power* you have *to perform, whilſt to will is preſent with you*, how little your αὐτεξούσιον, your *liberum arbitrium* ſignifies, ſith all your care to avoid reflections, and hard words, has prevailed no more: ſo likewiſe, how true that Proverb is, *viz. The Eye ſee's not it ſelf*; and above all it ſhews how defective that Righteouſneſs of yours is, which you ſeem to truſt to, yea, how defective you are now and then, in your very *morallity*, whereof ſpeaking the truth, and nothing but truth, is a great part, which you have not done: For when you have made hundreds of reflexions, ſcoffs, and taunts (for the figure *Irony* runs throughout all your Book,) you take the freedom to ſay that you have carefully avoid-

ed ſuch things, and *have given no hard words.* A hard heart will not let a man himſelf feel it, when he gives other Folks as hard words as can be given them.

The Engliſh, and meaning, of all this carping and ſnarling of yours is, you think much that thoſe honeſt Miniſters (who have peaceably ſuffered for, and under the ſcruples of their Conſciences) ſhould have a place in the hearts of the People, who have none, or very ſmall ones, elſewhere: *Your Eye is evil becauſe God's has been good* towards them. They do but juſt live, and you grudge it them. Methinks I hear you ſpeaking like *Haman, Heſt.* 7. 13. *Yet all this availeth me nothing, ſo long as I ſee Mordecai the* Jew *ſitting at the King's Gate.* You think *all the water loſt that runs beſide your Mill; would you dwell alone upon the Earth?* Woe be to diſſenters, if the *Comprehenſion*, or *Bill of eaſe*, did depend upon men of ſo ill a Nature, as by your Book, all that are concerned in it, do take you to be. Were you but as fat as Doctor *M.* (as a great man told a better man than your ſelf upon leſs reaſon) 'tis like you would be better conditioned, and better humoured. As if the peaceable Diſſentors were *Babylon*, or *Babylonians*, methinks I hear you cry, down with them, down with them to the very ground. And to the end they may think they ſhall do God good Service who ſhall ſet themſelves againſt them, you repreſent them as perſons who feed the People with Chaff inſtead of Wheat, give them *ſtones* for *bread*, and *Scorpions for fiſh*; I mean put them

them off (to use your own words) with *tittle tattle*, (a Phrase you have borrowed of the Women, dwelling not far from *Billinsgate*) and *vain talk*.

And now, Sir, do you not feel your self a very great man after that you have encountred seven of those whom you would have the World think do pass for the *Goliah's*, the great Giants of the Non-Conformists, the main Pillars of their Church? (If you will not allow them to be of the same Religion, or Church with your self?) I say now you have laid those seven sprawling and gasping for breath at your feet, do you not seem to your self to be as *a Giant refresht with Wine, mighty to run his Race?* Or as some Inchanted Knight, whom no Bullet can enter? But stay (good Sir) deceive not your self, for you are all this while but *a chip of the Old Block*; you are not the *Captain General* of the standing Army rais'd by I know who, against the *N. C.* (for he that rais'd it meant to be, and is taken for *General* himself,) you do but trale a Pike under him, and (as proper a man as you are) will never come to be so much as an *Ensigne*, till you write a Book that is all of it good sense. You were not the first incendiary who kindled a dreadful fire of Contention against the *N. C.* in four several places, and did himself Erect a brass Monument of his so doing, which may last as long as that by *Pudding-Lane*; you are but one of those who were to throw a Fire-ball, now, and then, to carry on the Work. You are but a spark, struck from the Forge of that *Vulcan*,

who made the first Thunderbolts that were to be used against the Non-Conformists. Don't you think, like the fly upon the Coach-wheel, that you have raised all this dust; It was that which I tell you, of, that *primum mobile*, to which most is to be ascribed. He it was that was *the seed of evil doers* in this kind. It was a certain *still sow that eat up all the drought*. He it was that must expect a double portion of the blessing, which belongs to *Peace-makers*, or rather the contrary. He is the man whose books will give him comfort when he comes to die; you are but a *Petitoe*, in comparison of him, though your bodily stature be beyond his. Never think to make your self considerable by writing new *Fr.* Debates, for the world begins to grow sick of them, and their Authors. Read such passages as you find in *Amos* 1. 6, 9, 11. & *ch.* 2. 1, 6, 7, *&c.* where are recorded Gods Judgments upon such as were cruel to their Brethren; and then learn to fear, and do so no more.

Alas (Sir) 'twere endless to tell you all the faults that may be found with your book; why do you make so little mention of Scripture, whilst you treat of great Theological points? *viz.* about *Union to Christ*, *Communion with the blessed Trinity*, the *Righteousness* of Christs Imputed. Is Scripture, in a Book or Sermon, like *Colocynth*, in a Purge, which great care must be taken that you do not give too much of it? for Sermons, you know, must not be made *over-working* (some folks are deadly afraid lest a *Hypercatharsis* should follow upon their Preaching, whereas others

with

wiſh they could purge out all ill humors:) or is it becauſe the mixture of Scripture with their purer ſtile, is but the debaſing of Silver, or Gold, with the allay of ſome courſer Mettal? would it interrupt the ſmooth current of your more elegant Stile? or is it becauſe you find ſo few Scriptures that look as if they would ſerve your purpoſe as *Volunteers*, and are loth to *preſs* any into your ſervice? The laſt methinks is moſt probable. I muſt recal my ſelf, and confeſs that you have quoted abuudance of texts of Scripture, now, and then, eſpecially in that Chapter in which you moſt profeſſedly, and induſtriouſly oppoſe the Imputation of our Saviour's Righteouſneſs, *&c.* but the reaſon why you quote them is, that you may ſhew (as well as you can) that no one of them, nor yet all of them put together, are ſufficient to prove that Believers are juſtified by the righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt imputed to them, *&c.* You quote them not for the purpoſe of planting, but of plucking up; not to build with, but to deſtroy. Where you have not ſome ſuch deſign as that in quoting of holy Writ, there your quotations do not *whiſper* (as they ſay in another caſe) but *hollow* each to other. Your Judgment ſeems to be againſt the quoting of Scripture, by what you write *page* 98. in deriſion of the Non-Conformiſts, *viz. You ſhall find* (ſay you) *their Books ſtuffed with Scripture, or if you talk with them, their whole diſcourſe is little elſe but Scripture phraſe.* What *Stuff* do you make of the *Holy Scripture* that you uſe ſo unhanſome a phraſe? If you have read the *Homilies*

of the Church of *England*, (whereto you have ſubſcribed) (not that I blame you for that, for they are very ſound and good) you have found ſometimes the greateſt part of a whole page together conſiſting of nothing elſe but the quotation of Scriptures, in words at length, which you call being *ſtuffed with Scriptures*, you might as well have ſaid *cramb'd*, or *larded*. Thus have you ſtruck at the *Homilies* of the Church through the Loins of the Non-Conformiſts, as you have done at ſeveral paſſages of great and excellent Biſhops, *Davenant*, *Morton*, &c. when you found them in the Books of Non-conformiſts, and knew not from whence they had them, as if finding them there you had had as good Authority for the abuſing of them, as he produced, who told a Woman, profeſſing better things, when he found her at a Play, *Inveni in meo*. But that you have expoſed the ſayings of our Eminent Biſhops, ſeizing them as *Wafts*, and *ſtrays*, to uſe them at your pleaſure, when you found them in the Writings of the Non-Conformiſts, unleſs I ſhould think you had abandoned all ſenſe of ſhame, I muſt needs conclude was done *ignorantly*, as they ſay, *The blind ſwalloweth many a Fly*, and therefore I hope it will be forgiven you.

Let me ask you the reaſon of one thing more, why ſo little mention of the name of *Chriſt* (ſave when you deride men for pretending Acquaintance with his Perſon? which if you your ſelf do not pretend too, you do not pretend your ſelf to be a good Chriſtian.) As if one man did ſay to another,

another, as they in *Amos* 6. 10. *Hold thy tongue, for we may not make mention of the name of the Lord*: ſo here, of the name of Chriſt, unleſs it be of his Laws only, ſome are wonderful ſparing of taking the name Chriſt into their mouths, as the *Jews* were of taking the word *Jehovah*, and would uſe *Adonai* in the room of it. Some have ſuſpected a *Snake in the graſs*, when they have met with Chriſt ſo ſeldom mentioned, in Books, and Sermons, in which there was great occaſion for it. If we forget the name of Chriſt, we ſhall be in danger of hereafter forgetting the thing (or the Perſon rather) and if we talk of nothing but his Laws, we ſhall in time forget his Benefits, *&c.*

But ſith I muſt not expoſtulate with you *in infinitum*, the laſt thing I ſhall impeach you of, at the preſent, is, That you have run with a mighty current, and ſwift ſtream, againſt the known Sentiments, and Doctrines of the *Church of England*, declared in the *Articles* and *Homilies*; Particularly as to the higheſt point in Divinity: *viz.* the *Juſtification* of a Sinner by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, imputed to him, upon his believing; or by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to him, and applyed by Faith. That charge I ſhall make good againſt you abundantly when it ſhall fall in courſe.

I am bold to ſay, that I my ſelf whom you think to be but a lame Conformiſt, ſhall in the judgment of all Orthodox Miniſters, *Arch-Biſhops*, *Biſhops*, and others, be own'd upon mature deliberation, to be ten times more conformable

to the *Church of England*, than your ſelf is, if all things be weighed in the Ballance, not of *Intereſt*, and *Prejudice*; but of *Religion*, *Conſcience*, and *Reaſon*. I do agree with the *Church of England* in all its Fundamental Doctrines, yea in all contain'd in 36 Articles (which in Q. *Eliz.* days was accepted for Conformity as to matter of Subſcription.) Thoſe, the Church will ſay, contain all things neceſſary for me, or any men to believe, or practice, or for any Miniſter to *Preach* in order to the ſaving of his own, or hearers ſouls: To deny ſome of theſe Articles our Church accounts damnable, (witneſs the *Athanaſian Creed*) and conſequently, that theſe Miniſters are not like to ſave, but rather to damn (as much as in them lieth) the ſouls of their hearers, who Preach againſt the Doctrine contained in ſome of theſe Articles: But if there be any thing that any Non-Conformiſt ſcruples, who aſſents to the truth of theſe Articles, it is not of that nature and conſequence, that by ſo doing he is in danger to damn either his own ſoul, or theirs that hear him, *&c.* or leſs qualified (as to Eſſentials) to make a meet and uſeful Miniſter of the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt. Now to conſent in *Eſſentials*, and *Fundamentals*, I trow, whilſt men differ *in rebus a diaphoris*, or in indifferent & arbitrary things, is I hope leſs dangerous, and far more tollerable, than whilſt men profeſs, and practice conformity in the *Mint*, *Anniſe*, and *Cummin*, that is required of them, to neglect, yea reject the great and weightieſt Truths, and Duties of the Law or Goſpel. It ſeems but reaſon-

able

nable that the beſt Livers, and the ſoundeſt Proteſtants, ſhould be counted better Conformiſts in a Chriſtian Proteſtant Church, than thoſe that are not of ſo good lives, and who greatly ſymbolize either with *Socinians*, or *Papiſts*, or both.

I hope to ſay enough hereafter to prove, that the Church of *England* is neither in whole nor in part, either *Socinian*, or *Popiſh*; howſoever unhappily it comes to paſs that ſome who have ſubſcribed *Aſſent, and Conſent* to all, and every thing belonging to the Doctrine, and Diſcipline of the *Church of England*, do Preach, and Teach quite blank contrary, and wound the Church through the Non-Conformiſts ſide, and as it were recant, and recal that Faith which they had plighted to the Church, when firſt admitted into the Miniſtry, and ſue out a Divorce as to their moſt intimate Converſe with her in her greateſt, and moſt ſaving Doctrines (as that of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, *&c.*)

Sir, Give me leave to expoſtulate with you a little, which of theſe two are the better, and truer Conformiſts to the Church of *England* (Religion, and ſound Doctrine being Judges) they that own the Church aforeſaid to be a true Church in which Salvation is to be had, as the moſt of thoſe Non-Conformiſts which I know (If I miſtake not) do; or you, or ſuch as you (if there be any more of the ſame gang) who though not directly, and expreſsly, yet indirectly and by manifeſt conſequence, do quite *Unchurch* that, which Non-Conformiſts own by the

the Name of the Church of *England*, and for a true Church. That you do ſo by conſequence, (and you preſume your ſelf to underſtand Conſequences as well as moſt men, and if ſo, muſt needs do it wittingly, and wilfully) I ſhall forthwith prove.

They who impute to the Church of *England*, one, or more great Errors, in, and concerning the greateſt Doctrines of Chriſtian Religion, which Error there is light enough for her to ſee, do *Unchurch* her. But you impute to our Church Fundamental Errors, which you ſuppoſe there is ſufficient light for her to ſee. *Ergo.*

The Major Propoſition I prove thus. That, in which is no Salvation, to them who depart not from the Doctrine hereof, is no true Church. But the Church of *England*, for that it groſsly erreth, (according to you) in one (if not more) of the greateſt, and moſt Fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtiany, hath no Salvation in it, for thoſe that depart not from the Doctrine thereof, having light enough to ſee thoſe Eerrors. *Ergo.*

That there is no Salvation in a Church, which wilfully Erreth in Fundamentals (which is one branch of your Minor) I prove thus, *viz.* Becauſe they who wilfully err (living and dying) in Fundamental points, cannot be ſaved. For only thoſe points are truly called Fundamental, unto us, without the underſtanding and belief whereof we cannot be ſaved.

Moreover, That Church which wilfully rejecteth any Fundamental Doctrine is Heretical, and

and Hereſie truly ſo called, is a damning ſin, and conſequently the Church of *England* is guilty of damnable Hereſie; and conſequently is ſelf-condemned, and how much more will God, who is greater, condemn it for the ſame?

The Minor Propoſition I prove thus. They who ſay that the Church of *England* doth groſsly err in the great Doctrine of Juſtification, do ſay that ſhe errs in one of the moſt Fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity. But you ſay ſo. *Ergo.*

The laſt Minor (for I think the Major needs no proving, *viz.* That the Doctrine of Juſtification is a great Fundamental) *I prove thus.*

They who ſay that men are not juſtified by the Righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt imputed to them upon their believing, but by their own works, or ſincere (though imperfect) obedience to the Goſpel, do ſay the Church of *England* groſsly erreth in the great Doctrine of Juſtification. But ſo ſay you. *Ergo.*

The reaſon of the laſt Minor properly is this, becauſe the Church of *England* ſaith quite otherwiſe than you do. *Viz.* Article 11th. *We are accounted Righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord, and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, by Faith, and not by our own works, and deſervings. Wherefore that we are juſtifyed by Faith only, is moſt wholeſome Doctrine, and very full of comfort,* &c. See alſo what Mr. *Rogers* ſaith in his Comment upon the Articles of the Church of *England, page* 55. *That Works have no place, or part, in Juſtification, is evident from the Holy Scripture,* &c. Moreover he ſaith,

ſaith, *All Churches Reformed with a ſweet conſent applaud, and confeſs this Doctrine.* page *Ibid.* line *ult.*

It was well for you that you did not live in the year 1604. for then for ſuch a book as you have written, you had been Excommunicated *ipſo facto*, by vertue of Canon the fourth, and fifth made in that year, which you will find ſet down at large juſt after the Preface in Mr. *Rogers* his Book aforeſaid.

Now put all theſe things together which the Church of *England* acknowledgeth to be neither *pars cultus*, nor *medium cultus*, but matters of *decency*, and *order*, and alterable at the pleaſure of the Rulers of the Church, are they of half that conſequence as is the Doctrine of Juſtification alone, which they who wreſt, and pervert, do it to their own deſtruction, and building beſides the foundation, not only their works, but themſelves will be burn'd if they repent not; and whilſt others who build upon the Foundation *hay and ſtubble* ſhall be ſaved *as by fire*, thoſe will not be ſaved at all. See *Gal.* 5. 5. *Chriſt is made of no effect to you: ſo many of you as are juſtified by the Law are fallen from Grace.* And *Gal.* 3. 10. *So many as are of the works of the Law are under a curſe.*

Thus you ſee what pains you have taken to Proſelite people to a Doctrine which would make them *twofold more the children of hell* than they would otherwiſe be. If any that call themſelves Proteſtants have told me, and others, that I, and they, were not of their Religion, by

you

you I ſeem to underſtand their meaning, *viz.* That whereas I profeſs my ſelf to be ſuch another Proteſtant as were the Sons of the Church of *England* in Queen *Elizabeths* days, you are of a new ſort of Proteſtants to be called (if there were any beſides your ſelf) *Socinian-Popiſh-Proteſtants*, for in the point of Juſtification, you, for your part, are no better; as I ſhall plainly evince hereafter (for theſe are but the heads of that charge which I am to make good againſt you.)

The heads of your *Hydra*, your Book I mean, do ſo multiply upon me that I know not how to make an end of my Preface, becauſe not of your Charge.

'Tis ſcarce worth mentioning (among ſo many greater crimes of yours) how you have out-fac'd, and out-dar'd the the *Fr.* Debater, and his Seconds, and Thirds, who have been ſo modeſt as to conceal their own names, and all but the two firſt Letters of thoſe whom they write againſt; but you ſet your name at large to the frontiſpiece, and the names of thoſe you write againſt in words at length and not in figures *toties, quoties. Audaces Fortuna juvat*, and if you miſcarry in your adventure, it may be ſaid, *Magnis tamen excidit auſis.*

Sir, Though you have contended with good, and great men, had it been about ſmall, and diſputable Truths, I had let you alone. If you had ſtreined at *Gnats* (and now I preſume I muſt be jear'd for calling little Truths *Gnats*, and told that Truths, and *Gnats* ſort *like Brains and*

Stairs)

ſtaires) Truths are not *Gnats*, but ſmall Truths are like them in point of ſmalneſs, neither was Chriſt a *Thief*, but he will ſteal upon the ſecure World unawares, and therefore he is called ſo. I ſay provided you had ſwallowed *Camels*, or the great Truths, though you had ſtrained at *Gnats*, or thoſe that are leſs, and diſputable, I would not have Ingag'd you, but when as he ſaid, *Fight neither againſt great nor ſmall, but againſt the King of* Iſrael: you have fought againſt the King of Truths (as I may call it) *viz.* the true notion of the Doctrine of Juſtification, pardon me if in true Allegiance to that great Prince Truth (whoſe Subjects we all ought to be) I have taken up Arms againſt you. Had you gone about to tumble down ſome ſmall Verities (like the ſmall ſtars in the milky way) I had let you alone, but when I perceive you like the Dragon ſpoken of, *Rev.* 12. indeavouring to draw the third part of the ſtars of Heaven with your Tail, (yea, the very Sun out of the Firmament) I cannot hold my peace. I am deceived if I have not met with ſome hints, and girds like that which *Eliab (David's* Elder Brother) gave to him, 1 *Sam.* 17. 28. in order to diſcouraging of me from this enterprize.

Other great Non-Conformiſts have been very earneſt with me not to Write againſt you, leſt as I loſt my *fatted Calf* the time before, ſo now my *Ewe-Lamb* ſhould go after it. But I am confident that the Rulers of our Church are ſo Orthodox, generally, that they will rather countenance and incourage me for vindicating the ancient,

ancient, fundamental Doctrines of the Church of *England*, than ſnib and ſtarve me for ſo doing, Unleſs I did think them to be *Socinians* and *half-Papiſts*, I cannot ſuſpect they will touch one hair of my head for what I have now written againſt you, who have written ſuch a Book as I never ſaw before, nor have heard the like things at any time from thoſe two great lights of the preſent Age, Dr. *Tillotſon*, or Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and others of the ſame Character with them. I never heard them once deride *Acquaintance with Chriſt* in their Pulpits, *&c.* They had more wit, and more virtue, than to do ſuch a thing. Yet 'tis twenty to one but you have heard what reports have been ſpread about the Town, (I ſay not concerning thoſe two Worthies which I laſt named, but ſome others reckoned to be of affinity with you,) upon occaſion of your Book, as if their heads, or hands, or hearts were in it, though I hope ſome who have been named in that caſe do abhor the Errors in it as much as I and others do. I hope the effect of it will be this, *viz.* that thoſe worthy Gentlemen whoſe Names have been brought in queſtion by your means, will vindicate themſelves, by frequently Preaching their *Contra-Socinian*, as well as they do their *Contra Antinomian* Notions.

I am the more angry with you for the Errors which you have written, becauſe I am ſure you did never ſuck them in with your Mothers milk, but are the heterodox Son of Orthodox Parents, a degenerous branch of good Roots.

I have obſerv'd it to bode ill, and end worſe, when thoſe Children, whoſe Parents have been Sober, Godly, and Wiſe; have thought themſelves too wiſe, and too good to be of the Religion of their Parents, (though that were as good, as good could be,) and have loaded thoſe with ſcorn who were of the ſame judgment with their worthy Parents, thereby wounding thoſe who begat, and bore them, at the ſecond hand, though not at the firſt, through the ſides of others, though not through their own, immediately.

I have thought ſuch men did little conſider thoſe words of *Solomon*, Prov. 1. 8. *My Son hear the Inſtruction of a Father, and forſake not the Law of thy Mother*, (which advice is repeated, *chap* 6. 20. & *chap.* 23. 22.) What one ſaith of a *Wife* is I think as applicable here to a *Son*, *viz.* that *A Son who is really wiſer than his Father is worth his weight in Gold*, but a Son that only thinks himſelf ſo to be (as is the general caſe) is not to be indured. They who have put off reverence to their Parents, will hardly put on reverence towards any body elſe. Were that your *Original ſin* which diſcovereth its ſelf in your Book, were it ſomething *ex traduce*, or *bred in the bone*, all I could ſay would hardly convince you that there were any great hurt, or danger in it, leſt of all, that you might juſtly be condemn'd for it, but it is an actual deviation from that Copy, and Law, which you are bid to follow in the Texts laſt cited, it is breaking all the bonds, and Laws of your Education, which

which would have more ſafely conducted you, and flying in the faces of thoſe Perſons, and Truths, which from your Child-hood you were taught to honour. They generally prove pernicious Perſons that do ſo, and do verifie that ſaying, *viz. Corruptio optimi eſt peſſima.* The beter any thing was, the worſe it is when once corrupted. Alas for the Age we live in, in which it is too often ſeen that when the Father was a *Solomon*, and the Son is but a *Rehoboam*, comparative to the Father's Wiſdom, yet ſuch do think themſelves wiſer men than their Fathers. Whilſt the Age mends at that rate it will *mend* (as they ſay) *like ſower Ale in ſummer.* And the Poets words will be found true, *viz. Ætas Parentum pejor avis tulit nos nequiores*, Yea, I may add *ſtultiores.* I Write not this to judge any man for his Conformity to the Church of *England* (for who made me a Judge in that caſe?) but to blame thoſe who do not only diſſent from their Natural Parents (or affect to ſeem ſo to do) but alſo from their *Mother* the Church, betwixt whom and the Parents of their Bodies, in all Fundamental Doctrines, there is a perfect harmony and agreement, though they did never ſubſcribe unfained *Aſſent, and Conſent* thereunto, which their diſſenting Children have done. I no where reflect upon you, nor have any controverſie with you, for being *Epiſcopal*, but for being *Epiſcopial*, (if I may ſo call it.) They who attempt real, or ſeeming, Innovations in Religion, in a Romantick, Drolling, and Scornful ſtile, may poſſibly to a degree prejudice and pull

down the Old, and Excellent Religion, but will not be able to build up, or eſtabliſh any other in the ſtead thereof: for carping, ſnarling, and quibling in matters of Religion, will be found a ſandy Foundation, on which nothing can be built for perpetuity.

Sir, till I heard one ſtory, which I am now to tell you, me-thoughts I was not free (as they ſay) to deal ſo roundly with you as you may now ſuppoſe me to have dealt, but had ſomething within me, ſaying as *David* concerning *Abſalom*, *Deal gently for my ſake with the Young Man*, &c. but when I was paſt doubt of the truth of the ſtory which I am now about to tell, my heart became a little hardned towards you, and I have often thought of thoſe words. *Titus* 1. 13. *Rebuke them ſharply that they may be ſound in the Faith.* To rebuke ἀποτόμως you know is to do it cuttingly, or to touch to the quick, or to do like Chirurgions, who with their Corroſives do eat out proud and dead fleſh.

But the ſtory which I promis'd you is yet behind, and it is this.

Sir, by a Letter of your own, dated, *April* 1. 1673. (which I chanced to ſee) I am thus inform'd, *viz.* that in a Sermon which you Preach'd at St. *Dunſtans*, not long before the Date of the ſaid Letter, concerning our *growth in Grace* you did Diſcourſe as followeth. Having repreſented the advantage of converſing with good men, you proceeded to ſhew whom you meant by good men, *viz.* *Thoſe who by the innocency, and uſefulneſs of their lives, will recommend*

mend the practice of virtue, and by the charms, and pleasantness of their conversation will endear you to it. Thus far you said very well (unless the word *charms* so applied do in some ears sound a little fantastically, as some other of your expressions do, *viz.* the *Caresses* of our Saviours *Love, the Fortunes of Christ*, &c. may seem to do) you go on well, and say. *I do not take those men to be good company who are sour, morose, and peevish, who have nothing to entertain you with but some whining, and tragical complaints of the badness of the times, and the miscarriages of Governors, or the general looseness, and debauchery of the age*, &c. *for this affrights all men from Religion who have gay and brisk spirits (well phrased) and are unwilling to condemn themselves to eternal* (with your favor 'tis but temporal) *sighs, and complaints.* Thus far you have run pretty well, who did hinder you that you did not persevere? Yet I must tell you if *Lot*, that just man, were living, he would *vex his righteous soul with the unrighteous conversation* of this, as of the age he liv'd in (for which he was commended).

But mark what followeth. *Much less are those good Companions who are perpetually complaining of the corruption of our natures, and the wickedness of our hearts, and the impossibility of keeping Gods Laws, that is, who make excuses for sin before hand, and discourage men from so much as attempting to live virtuously. For my part I should rather chuse the company of profest Debauchees, than of such men.*

Now this Paragraph (if I mistake not) is

Tota litura, one intire blot, a diſeaſed Paragraph, in which is no ſound part. It gives me not time to ſmile at the expreſſion of *gay and brisk ſpirits* which you make uſe of, which in a theological diſcourſe ſounds a little *Cantingly*, and affectedly, and to have a ſmatch of gentle non-ſenſicalneſs. I have heard of gay colours, gay cloathing, but never before of *gay ſpirits*. When in the Climate of *Billinſgate*, you Cant (if that be Canting) courſely, ſpeaking of *tittle, tattle*, &c. but when in the more gentle Climate of St. *Dunſtuns*, then you think that the Epithites of *gay, and brisk, appli'd* to the ſouls of men, do well become you. I find you have a *brisk* ſpirit of your own, but how *gay* it is I cannot tell. Premiſing, that you ſay concerning the laſt, and every other Paragraph, which I have quoted in a different Character, to ſhew it is yours. *This I have faithfully tranſcribed out of my own notes, and I do not uſe to vary from them*, I proceed to find fault with what you have ſaid. Firſt, you fight with a ſhadow, *viz.* a ſort of people whom you repreſent to be *perpetually* complaing of the corruption of our natures, and the wickedneſs of our hearts. Who ever did ſo *perpetually?* who ever talk'd of that and nothing but that? Your meaning then muſt be who *frequently* do ſo. And doe's not the word of God frequently do ſo? What think you of *Rom.* 7. 15, 18, to v. 25. was St. *Paul* addicted to *whining?* was he no good company becauſe he there complains, *What I would that I do not, but what I hate that I do*, v. 15. and v. 18. *In me, that is, in my fleſh dwells no good thing:*

thing: for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not. Doth St. *Paul* in this, and in the following verses make excuses for sin before hand? and discourage men from attempting to live virtuously? Yet all that he speaks, by way of complaint, witness *v.* 24. *O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?* Would you rather chuse the company of profest Debauchees, than of such a man as St. *Paul* was? because of his frequent complaining of the corruption of our natures?

Mind what the fame Apostle saith, *Gal.* 4 17. *The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: So that ye cannot do the same things that ye would.* Read also *Rom.* 3. 23. *All have sinned and come short of the Glory of God.* Peruse also *Eph.* 2. 1, 2, 3, 5. *verses.* Hitherto St. *Paul*, Now that you may have it from the mouth of two Witnesses, observe what St. *James* saith, *Jam.* 1. 14. *Every man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own Concupiscence and is enticed.* There I am sure mans *Concupiscence* is complain'd of, as that which tempts, draws away, and enticeth him. For a third Witness take St. *Peter*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 1. *Abstain from fleshly Lusts which fight against the Soul.* Now what is that latter expression but a heavy Complaint against those fleshly Lusts which are in men, for that they make War against their Souls? Our blessed Saviour was no *whiner* for he came *eating* and *drinking*, insomuch that they call'd him, *Mat.* 11. 19. *A man gluttonous and a Wine-Bibber,*

a friend of Publicans, and ſinners. (Becauſe he liv'd chearfully and converſably) yet we find him making grievous complaint of the wickedneſs of man's heart (who had no wicked heart of his own to complain of) *Mat.*15.19. *Out of the Heart proceed evil Thoughts, Murthers, Adulteries, Fornications, Thefts, Falſe-witneſs, Blaſphemies. Chriſt*, and *Moſes*, are agreed upon this point to complain of the wicked hearts of men. *Gen.* 6. 5. *God ſaw that the wickedneſs of man was great in the Earth, and that every imagination of his heart were evil continually.* Is that a Complaint or is it none? So *Gen.*8. 21. *For the imagination of mans heart is evil from his Youth?* Which words are ſo brought in as if God had ſaid, ſhould I deſtroy the World ſo often as I find it very wicked, *toties quoties* I ſhould be ever and anon deſtroying it, for, *&c.* If the Prophet *Jeremy* muſt not be rejected for a *Whiner*, becauſe a Weeping Prophet, hear what he ſaith, *Jer.* 17. 9. *The Heart is deceitful above all things, and deſperately wicked, who can know it? Solomon* was no *Melancholico*, I think, (and doubtleſs as wiſe a man as your ſelf) and yet he ſaith, *Eccleſ.* 9. 3. *Yea, alſo the heart of the ſons of men is full of evil, and madneſs is in their heart while they live, and after that they go to the dead.* Now if *Moſes*, and *Solomon* and the Prophet *Jeremy*, yea, if St. *Paul*, St. *Peter*, St. *James*, yea if our Bleſſed Saviour himſelf, were he upon the Earth, was not ſuch company as you would chuſe, God deliver me from company of your chuſing—— All and every of theſe did complain of the wickedneſs

wickedneſs of our hearts, and corruption of our natures. Therefore according to you (goo dSir) They *who are ſowre, moroſe, and peeviſh, who have nothing elſe to entertain you with, but whining and tragical complaints of the badneſs of the times, and the miſcarriages of Governors,* are perſons whoſe company is leſs to be ſhun'd than theirs. Are you ſplitting upon the Rock of Blaſphemy e're you are aware of it? Has Pride, and Paſſion, ſo tranſported you, that you ſay you know not what? Is it more tollerable to complain of the miſcarriages of our Governors, and to be always doing it, (which may amount to Sedition, yea Treaſon in ſome caſes) than of the wickedneis of our own hearts? of the badneſs and corruption of the times (which factious men are wont to do) than of the *Corruption of our own Natures?* what Divinity? or what Pollicy? or what Reaſon, or *Sence* is there in this? Yea are they which complain much of the naughtineſs of their hearts worſe than the very *Debauchees* of the times? I mean more dangerous company than they? Have you try'd both? Have you found your ſelf to return worſe from the Company of thoſe men who complain much of the corruption of their natures than from theirs, who do nothing elſe but Drink, and Swear, and talk obſenely, and do filthily and ſcoff at all Religions? (for thoſe are the Debauchees of the Age) I could never experiment any ſuch thing yet, though I have been occaſionally in the company of both theſe ſorts of men whom you compare together.

'Tis *rotten Communication* proceeding out of mens

mens hearts, not Communication touching the rottenneſs and corruption of their hearts (bewailing and lamenting it) *that corrupts good manners.*

Sir, By this vile paſſage in your Sermon, you have ſtrengthned the hands of ungodly men, given them to think themſelves better than thoſe who in the ſight of God and men are far better than they. Had *Atheiſts*, and Villains (as you call them) no Advocate to plead for them but you? Are you become their *Leviathan?* or who ever expected that you would have been ſo? Prayer is not in uſe with them, elſe they would hold themſelves bound to pray for you, for giving them the preference to thoſe whoſe death heretofore, they, or ſome of them, did wiſh (as *Baalam* in the like caſe) they might die, and that their latter end might be like theirs. Poſſibly they will uſe to drink your health next to his Majeſties, and that of the Royal Family, for you have ſpoken for them at ſuch a rate as ſcarce any man but one of themſelves ever did. For ſhame, *let Baal plead for himſelf*, let *Debauchery* plead its own cauſe, and do you never plead its cauſe more; Let *Folly*, as *Wiſdome* is, *be juſtified only of her own Children.* Extenuate not groſs Atheiſm, and Profaneſs, or their faults, who commit all iniquity with greedineſs, and declare their ſins like *Sodom*, by ſaying that weak Chriſtians are worſe than they. I fear you ſpeak againſt the light of your own *experience*: For do you not know full well that the generality of thoſe who are much in thoſe complaints which you complain

plain of, do live righteouſly, ſoberly and godly in the world, which Debauchees do not? I dare ſay you had rather when your time to die ſhall come, have your ſoul gathered to the ſouls of them from whom you have heard ſuch complaints, *viz.* of the Corruption of their natures, *&c.* than to the ſouls of them who liv'd and di'd meer Debauchees, *&c.*

Poor *Phaeton*, whither art thou driving the Chariot of the Sun? Down thou wilt come very ſpeedily for the pride of thy heart, which hath cauſed thee to overlook Scripture, Reaſon, and common Experience, the wholſome Laws of thy pious Education, and what ſoever elſe would reſtrain thee from doing evil, that poor innocent *Diſſentors* (unhappy enough in and by means of their own ſcruples if they be but ſcruples) might know how much thou hateſt them, or envieſt them, that little which they have or are, or ſeekeſt to ingratiate and to raiſe they ſelf by ſending their reputations after their eſtates, and leaving them as little of the former, as many of them have left of the latter. A proud peeviſh man (ſuch as many take your ſelf to be) charg'd with *Envy, aduſt choller, and hypocondriacal winds*, is like a great Cannon charg'd with powder, bullets and chain-ſhot, which not only goes off like a clap of Thunder, but threatens to do great execution: or like the earth ſurcharg'd with winds that can find no vent, which produceth terrible Concuſſions, and Earthquakes.

I think in my conſcience that the true reaſon of your writing againſt thoſe againſt whom you have

have written was this: God has vouchsafed to many Ministers that have been and are out of publick imployment, a greater interest in the esteem and affections of many good people in City, and Countrey, than to [illegible] now it fareth with you as with [illegible] Women answered one another [illegible] *Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands*, 1 Sam. 18. 7. you are very [illegible], and it displeaseth you, and you say (as he) *They have ascribed unto him ten thousands, and to me but thousands, and what can they have more, but*, &c.

From hence having a quarrel with their persons, you set your self to read their writings, and to try where you can pick any holes in them (which is no hard thing to do in, and by the Writings of any man whatsoever, if a man will set himself so to do) you that knew most things, and expressions have two handles, do resolve to take all theirs by the worst handle of the two. You put the worst construction that can be put upon those passages which you quote out of their books, when it were much easier to understand them in a sase and sober sence, you play the part of a Prevaricator, or *terræ filius* upon them, and all to make them seem ridiculous (right or wrong) whose fame, and reputation doth as you think, stand in your light; whereas, when you have said all you can, I am sure you either intend the same things which they express in other and plainer words, about *Union, and Communion with Christ*, and the benefits which we have

have by his righteouſneſs (and that I believe will be your only refuge at laſt, to ſay you do ſo) or if you do not, you contradict *Scripture, Reaſon,* and *Experience,* and the moſt declared ſenſe of the Church of *England,* as to the higheſt points of our Religion. Being ſo angry as you ſeem to be with thoſe who complain much of the corruption of their natures. I am a little jealous that you do ſcarce believe the corruption of humane nature by the fall of *Adam,* or the Doctrine of Original ſin; and that if you were to ſubſcribe the ninth Article of the Church of *England* over again, you could not do it without Equivocation, and mental reſervations: which Article is this, *Original Sin ſtandeth not in the following of Adame (as the Pelagians do vainly talk) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is ingendred of the offſpring of Adam, wheeeby man is very far gone from Original Righteouſneſs, and is inclined to evil; ſo that the fleſh luſteth againſt the ſpirit, and therefore in every perſon born into the world it deſerveth Gods wrath, and damnation.* If this Article be true (as I doubt not but it is, and wiſh that you did doubt it no more than I) it is, and ought to be for a Lamentation, that the nature of man, which came pure at firſt out of the hand of God is become thus corrupt, and defiled. Ought we to mourn over the corruption of others? and was there a *mark* of preſervation ſet upon them who *did ſigh and cry for all the abominations which were done in the midſt of Jeruſalem,* Ezek. 9. 4. and ought we not as much to mourn over the corrp-

tions

tions of our own natures, and hearts? What if even the Author of a book called *Preadamita*, do tell us (since I was even now speaking of Original Sin) That *If you take away the Doctrine of Imputed Sin (which is Original) and of imputed Righteousness, he doth not know of what use the whole Gospel is, or what it discovers to the world that might not have been known without it?* I am sure you deny the latter of these two Doctrines, and I greatly suspect you to deny the first, because you are so incensed against those who make the complaints aforesaid.

Sir, The truth is you would impose upon us something that should look like a new *System of Divinity* opposite to that of the former age, and if you durst own it of the Church of *England*; and if you can but get it received as such, it will do your work, for it is not *Truth* you contend for, nor can you doubt but that most of the passages which you have shamefully exposed might be taken in a very good and safe sense, but you have a mind to run down all the men of that character, and do hope your work will be done if you can baffle but these seven men, whose Writings you take to task; and that the world will believe that all the rest of Ministers out of their places are such as they, and do fall to the ground with them. But take my word for it, Sir, it will not do, your proud waves will break themselves against those Rocks, but break those Rocks they never can. The good lives and abilities of the generality of them will so enbalm their names, that if you were as deadly as death it self, you will never

ver be able to make them rot, or putrifie. If you think I have been too ſharp in this Epiſtle, know, and conſider, that it is uſually the lot and portion of them who do attempt the diſgrace, and diſturbance of inocent, and peaceable men, under hatches before (adding affliction to the the afflicted) to meet with marvellous rebukes from one hand or another, and for God to *put hooks in their noſes* and bridles in their lips, and to turn them back by the way which they came (as I may allude to *Iſa.* 37. 29.)

Now that I would fain be at the end of this expoſtulatory Epiſtle other provocations on your part do occur. You vilifie good men for complaining of *the impoſſibility of keeping the Law of God*, ſaying, *that thereby they do make excuſes for ſin before hand*, &c. I ſay it is a matter of juſt complaint, and lamentation, that we cannot keep the whole law of God, becauſe it betokens that man has loſt that power which God gave to *Adam* and *Eve*, when he firſt Created them, and which ſhould have been propagated to all Man-kind, had they continued in Innocency. *That all have ſinned and are come ſhort of the glory of God*, that now *in many things we all offend and cannot do otherwiſe is moſt juſtly to be bewailed.* It was not ſo from the beginning, God made man Righteous and able to kept his Law, as the Apple of his Eye, in every tittle of it.

Now to remember whence our firſt Parents fell, and we in, and with them, ought to grieve, and abaſh us. Did not St. *Paul* ſpeak it by way of Complaint that *the good he would do he could not*,

not, &c. that when to will was preſent with him he knew not how to perform, *&c.* which is all one with the impoſſibility of keeping Gods Law, in this corrupt and fallen eſtate. Did St. *Paul* in ſo complaining make Apology for Sin beforehand ? and make himſelf more dangerous company than the Debauchees of that, or this age ? The holy Ghoſt in Scripture doth often inſinuate the impoſſibility of our keeping the Law of God in *Statu quo nunc*, as when he ſaith, *What the Law could not do in that it was weak through the Fleſh, God ſending his Son, &c.* Meaning that the *Law*, or firſt Covenant, could not ſave men, becauſe they through the weakneſs of their fleſh, *i.e.* the corruption of their Nature, could not perfectly keep it, and that Law did ſay to ſuch as are under the Law, *Curſed be every one who continues not in all that is written to do it.*

Does not the Apoſtle elſe-where ſay, *When we were yet without ſtrength*, (*viz.* to keep the whole Law of God perfectly, and to make our ſelves happy under a Covenant of Works, by ſo doing) *in due time Chriſt died for the ungodly.* Though God under the Goſpel doth accept a ſincere, though imperfect obedience, ought we not to wiſh that our obedience could be perfect, and to bewail that it is not as St. *Paul* who thus complain'd, The Law is Spiritual, but I am Carnal, Sold under Sin, and O wretched Man that I am. Did thoſe with whom you find fault ſay, that it was impoſſible for them and other men to keep the Law of God more or leſs, or in any tollerable meaſure, or any better than they al-

way

ways do, through the unavoidable corruption of their Nature, and that that was from God, and not from themſelves this had been to have made excuſes for ſin before hand, but they are not charg'd with ſaying any ſuch thing, neither do they either ſay or think any ſuch thing, but their ſentiments are theſe, *viz.* that all mankind (Jeſus Chriſt excepted) is fallen into a corrupt, and weak Eſtate, which the great God was no wayes acceſſary to, much leſs the Author of it, by means of the fall of *Adam* and *Eve* who corrupted the Fountain of humane Nature, and conſequently all the ſtreams, for who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean, and that which is born of Fleſh (that is, of corrupted Mankind) is fleſh, *i. e.* ſinful and corrupted, *&c.* From thence reſulteth, as they think, yea, find both in Scripture, and by woful experience, an impoſſibility of keeping the Laws of God perfectly, though good men do, and are able, far to exceed others in the keeping of them, and doubtleſs might exceed themſelves, I mean their preſent degrees of holineſs, did they more *take heed to their wayes according to the Word of God*, and did they *give all diligence* (*which they ought to do*) *to make their Calling and Election ſure.* Now with ſuch limitations and proviſo's as theſe are to complain of the impoſſibility of keeping the Laws of God; firſt, as it is matter of truth (and what harm can truth do?) ſo it is ſo far from being an excuſe for breaking the Laws of God, that it is a great obligation upon them that ſpeak ſuch things to obſerve them more ſtrictly. For

till ſuch time as they have done all that is poſſible for them to do, 'tis a ſtark ſhame to complain of what is impoſſible, I mean, by way of excuſe, for it is no juſt excuſe: when men come at that which is impoſſible for them to do, then let them complain, and not till then: like a ſervant, who being ſent on his maſters errand, after many miles travell, meets with a deep water which he cannot paſs by one means or another, then it is time for him to return, and complain to his maſter, and not till then, ſith all the reſt of the way was paſſable, and he was to fulfill his maſters command ſo far as he could, *eſt aliquid prodire tenus ſi non datur ultra.* We ſay to children who crave more victuals, having a good deal on their trenchers, eat that firſt; and then, (and not till then) complain if we give you no more. Moreover, it may be conſtrued as a ſignification of the great deſire which ſuch men have to keep the Law of God perfectly, as *David* ſaith, *Pſal.*119. 4, 5. *Thou haſt commanded us to keep thy precepts diligently, O that my wayes were directed to keep thy ſtatutes.* It is the obſervation of one long ſince with God, that the deſires of good men after God, and goodneſs, are boundleſs, and have upon them ſome impreſſion and reſemblance of the *Infiniteneſs* of God; but their performances, we know, when they have done all, do fall vaſtly ſhort of ſuch large deſires, and thoſe Giant-like wiſhes (if I may ſo call them) produce a race of performances, of but an ordinary ſtature.

If you had ſo pleaſed, and had ſo much charity, you might have commended ſuch people for their

their good wiſhes, and deſires to be holy, even as God is, and to *attain to the reſurrection of the dead*, (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks,) though you had miſlik'd their entertaining their friends, from time to time (if there be any that do ſo) with no other diſcourſe but that, and chid them (as I think they are far from innocency, in that point,) who uſe no voice but that of the turtle, or who are alwayes mourning and complaining, of one thing or of another, whereas their duty is to *ſerve the Lord with gladneſs, and to come before his preſence with ſinging*, Pſal. 100. 2. Yea, that whole Pſalm excites to a chearful ſerving of God, &c. I ſay you might have chid them for their penſive way in Religion, (how well ſoever intended) mean time owning, that you could not but have ſome reſpect for their *zeal of God, though it were not altogether according to knowledge*, as betraying their ignorance of that liberty which God hath call'd them to, *viz.* to be *merry and ſing Pſalmes*, as well as at other times to *pray*, being *afflicted*, as alſo of what *Solomon* ſaith, *Eccl.* 3. 4. *A time to weep, and a time to laugh: a time to mourn, and a time to dance.* Honeſt intentions went far with St. *Paul. Rom.* 10. 2.

They whom you ſuppoſe to *diſcourſe continually of the impoſſibility of keeping the whole Law of God*, may, I ſuppoſe, be more eaſily reclaim'd, and brought off from that unſeaſonable trouble, which they many times give, as well to themſelves as others, (and perſwaded inſtead thereof, now and then to ſing *Hallelujahs*) than a *drunkard*, a *whoremaſter*, a *profane ſwearer and curſer*, a

ſcoffing *Atheiſt*, or *Infidel*, from their reſpective vices and villanies. That which you call *whining* is diſguſtful to them that hear very much of it, and conſequently there is little danger of imitating it, but gratifying the fleſh, as *Debauchees* do, is wondrous pleaſant, and therefore the example of ſuch will moſt eaſily infect us.

Thoſe *ever-whining people* (as you call them) do help to put us in mind of the corruption of our natures, and badneſs of our hearts, (which we are but too prone to forget, and ought often to remember) whereas the *Debauchees*, which you prefer to them, will put us in mind of little or nothing, but of *making proviſion for the fleſh*, and *treaſuring up wrath* to our ſelves *againſt the day of wrath*, and yet you have ſaid, (in an ill hour, God knows, even the worſt that could have been) that the *Debauchees* of the age, are leſs dangerous company than thoſe complainers.

Id credat Judæus Apella, non ego. Thus it is your manner, time after time, (and I know of what little *Machiavel* you learn'd that policy, and whom you ape in it, (as you do others in other things) to overlook all that is worthy in men, and books, which you do not love, and to expoſe only the real, or ſuppoſed failings of both, as if a Painter ſhould draw a ſcarf over the face and comely parts of a man, and in a very great figure, expoſe to view only thoſe parts which ſhould be alwaies hid. This is according to *Machiavel*, *Calumniari fortiter, ut aliquid hæreat*, when a man doth never rebate the edge of his accu-

accuſations, by the acknowledgment of any one virtue, or worthy thing reſiding in him whom he accuſeth, but horſe-fly, or *ſcarabæus* like, keeps ſucking, ſucking alwayes, and only, upon the gall'd places. 'Tis pretty to ſee how frequently you do ſet up a man of ſtraw, and then thraſh and belabour him, Like a man in a dream, you fancy you ſee ſuch and ſuch enemies, with their ugly vizards on, coming towards you, and fight them you muſt in your own defence, when there is no ſuch matter. Nay, I rather think, you do feign and ſet up ſuch men for your convenience, and for diſcourſe ſake, *viz.* men who decry acquaintance with the Laws and Goſpel of Chriſt, whilſt they cry up acquaintance with his *Perſon* only. Dr. *Owen* is poſitive in it, that you have highly wrong'd him, in imputing any thing of that nature to him. To the beſt of my knowledge, I never found one ſuch paſſage in all the Engliſh modern practical Divines that I have read, nor do believe there is any ſuch. You, ſeeming to attempt a new ſcheme and fabrick of Theology, do thereby caſt manifeſt reproach upon whatſoever our modern (and more ancient) grave, holy, and learned Divines, have written, and thereby do contradict that Character which that Oracle amongſt Scholars, *viz.* the Lord *Bacon*, gave of their writings, *viz. that if they were judiciouſly abridged, they would make the profitableſt and wiſeſt book in the world next our Bible.* This he ſaid of thoſe very books, which, if your book be true, are full of error and falſhood, for either theirs or yours muſt be falſe. Were he

alive, it is probable he would call you as you deſerve.

But why muſt thoſe things be faſtned upon men which they never ſaid? as namely, that we need not, or ought not, to acquaint our ſelves with the Laws and Goſpel of our Saviour, but only with his perſon, when no reaſon can be given of that charge, but only becauſe the men ſo accuſed do exhort us to be acquainted with the Perſon of Chriſt, never intending it *excluſivè*, of his Law and Goſpel, as if I ſhould adviſe a friend to get acquainted with the perſon of ſuch an excellent Scholar, ſaying nothing at the preſent of his good Library, and good notions, would it follow from thence, that I would have him never inquire into his Library, and learned notions, but only get acquaintance with himſelf? No, Acquaintance with himſelf is the way to bring on the reſt, &c.

But I now diſcern for what end you have ſet up this man of ſtraw (as I call him) *viz.* one that decries acquaintance with the Laws of Chriſt, *viz.* becauſe you have a great myſtery to declare to the world, *viz.* *That there can be no ſalvation without good living*, or, *that men muſt live well, if ever they would be ſaved*, doubtleſs, *a myſtery hid from ages and generations*, and never reveal'd till you reveal'd it, or rather known to all ages, and perſons, and becauſe ſo well known, you thought you muſt make the world believe that it did meet with many enemies and oppoſers, and thoſe men of name and note, for whoſe ſakes, and in order to the undeceiving of them,

you

you were forc'd to write ſuch a Book; whereas, I believe, from *Aldgate* to *Weſtminſter*, there is hardly a man or woman, whom the light within them, hath not taught to know, that as ſure as there is a heaven, there can be no getting thither, unleſs men live *righteouſly, and ſoberly, and godly* in this world.

Scarce knowing how to preach of any thing elſe, but *a good life* in the general, in tollerable good language (ſuch as the readers of Dr. *Taylors* works muſt needs have) (though there be divers *Credenda*, or *Articles* of *Faith* to be preacht of, as well as *Agenda*, or *Duties* to be done,) I ſay, you ſeeming to be a kind of a *ſtinted Divine*, (ſtak'd down as horſes ordinarily are to a ſmall compaſs of paſture) that can preach of little elſe but *the excellency of a good life* in the general, which is very good, but not alwayes and alone, (ſo Veniſon is good meat, but you would be cloyed with it, if you might never eat any thing elſe) repreſent to your ſelf and to the world, a power of adverſaries, coming with ſwords and ſtaves, to kill and ſlay that great myſterious truth, which no good man ever had the *wickedneſs*, no, no man in his wits ever had the ſillineſs, to oppoſe or deny. Never cry ἰυρηκα when you have diſcovered nothing but that two and two makes four, or what is as plain as that.

Were the mountains in travel all this while to bring forth but this? Alas, 'tis a *mouſe* to what might have been expected. Such *myſteries* as theſe need no *Revelations* to be annex'd to them, ſuch plain texts need no comments. Thus all the

duſt which you have rais'd is *de lana caprina, beating the air*, or fighting with your own ſhadow. Where were you when Mr. *Anthony Burges* deſtroyed all, and every the *Antinomians* (which held ſuch Doctrine as you charge theſe men with) and left not one of them (for ought I know) to tell the tidings of it? That work is done to your hand, we all own now a days that Chiſt is *the Author of Salvation*, only *to them that obey him*, &c.

You know that Mr. *B.* notwithſtanding you had complemented and labored to foreſtal him in your Preface) ſent you word, that *your Book was written with great ſcorn, and haughtineſs*, and how many more things he did object againſt it (which were many as I am certainly inform'd) though having dealt with you in the way of a private Letter, or admonition he was not willing to declare what the particulars were. Knowing that an *Apprehenſion of Contempt* is one of the greateſt (yea ſome ſay the only) cauſe of Anger, you have written with ſo much of that ingredient, as if your deſign were, not to proſelite any body to any truth, or truths which you conceive they deny, but to put your Antagoniſts into great heats and Paſſions: which is, as if a Fiſherman who ought to be very ſtill, and ſilent, ſhould make a great noiſe, and out-cry, by the Rivers ſide, the effect whereof would be, not to draw Fiſh to his net, but to drive, and ſcare them from it.

You make me think of a ſort of men, whom St. *Auguſtine* in his Confeſſions, *l.* 3. *c.* 3. *calls* Everſores, *or* Overturners, *whoſe humor was, malepertly*

pertly enough to come over the demurer, and baſh-fuller behaviour of thoſe whom they never ſaw before, whom they throughly vexed with abuſing, and jearing at, upon no occaſion, and all to maintain their own humour of bitter jeſting: nothing in the world can be liker the Devil himſelf, than this behaviour of theirs what name then may they more truly be called by than Overturners? *being themſelves overturn'd, and altogether perverted firſt, and that by thoſe ſeducing, and deceiving ſpirits ſecretly deriding them even for this that themſelves take ſo much delight to jear at, and to put tricks upon others.* Thus far St. *Auguſtine*, which I have given in *Engliſh*, that every Reader may underſtand it. You have ſcoffed not only at Diſſenting Divines, but at Syſtematical Divinity (to make your ſelf a ſcorner in the abſtract) which Divines of all perſwaſions had wont to have a veneration for, and gone about to ſhew your ſelf an *Overturner* as to that, for want of enough of which, I ſuppoſe it is that your ſelf is ſo unſound, and hetorodox in your Principles. Nay the Holy Scriptures themſelves ſo expounded as they ought to be, or the true expoſition of them has not eſcaped your deriſion. You tell us, *page* 104. That *Faith is luckily called coming to Chriſt*: yet Chriſt himſelf ſo expounds it, *John* 6. 35. *He that cometh to me ſhall never hunger, and he that believeth on me ſhall never thirſt.* Then you ſay, *That Faith which ſerves us as legs to go to Chriſt, muſt be a hand to receive him:* and yet our Saviour expounds *Receiving*, by *Believing*, John 1. 12, *But as many as received him, to them he gave power to become the Sons of God,*

even

even to them that believe on his name, &c. And so you proceed to *p.* 105, *&c.*

I'le give you the Testimony of one Godly, Able, Learned Divine, more (elder than Mr. *Baxter* himself) concerning your Book, who told me it divides it self, or may be divided into only three parts, *viz.* 1. The *Ignorant* or *Erronious* part. 2. The *Malicious*. 3. The *Profane* part. O Triple Crown, no less to be adored than that upon the head of the *Popes Holiness*, viz. the Crown of *Ignorance*, *Malice*, and *Profaness*.

Sir, what I have written may inable you to measure the height, and depth, of your misery, if either of those two great men, who I last told you do highly object against your book, had taken you into their hands. Then had you been broken upon the wheel, and the joynts of your book torn one from another, as upon a tormenting wrack; then shame, and confusion of face had covered you, and your book might have been a *By-word*, and a *Hissing* througout *England*: but you are fallen into the hands of an easie Adversary, one that can deal but gentle blows, (let him do his worst) and so all is well. You can read *Don Quixot* with pleasure, and laugh at the Windmills which play in his head. O happy man, that it was thy lot to escape some *Anti-Socinian* Ministers of the Church of *England*, who do abhor your book, as much as I can do (as being contrary to the Articles of the *English* Church.

But if you shall say to me, Why are you so zealous

zealous for the Articles of the Church of *England*, who are preſumed to be but a lamiſh Conformiſt? To that I anſwer, that ſince I ſaw your book, I am well aſſur'd that I ſtand upon better legs, as in reference to the Church of *England*, than you do: for I am ſound in the belief of all the *Articles* that concern *Faith*, and *Life* (which is the ſubſtance of our Religion) you are not ſo, though you practice thoſe things which in compariſon thereof are but meer ſhadows: ſo far as I go, I do yield unfained conſent, unfainedly, ſo have not you done, ſo far as you have gone. As half a ſound Orange, or Lemmon, is worth two whole ones, that are rotten, ſo a ſound Semi-Conformiſt, is worth two whole Conformiſts, that are rotten at the Core, unſound as to the Foundation, and ſuch as *Arch-Biſhop Lawd* (were he alive, and in place) would puniſh, who was no friend to *Socinians*, and *Socinianizing*.

As for the *New-Conformity* I do confeſs I am not very fond of it (nor it may be are greater men than I (witneſs the ſeveral overtures which have been made in both the Honorable Houſes of Parliament to give eaſe and relaxation as to that) becauſe my ſcruples about it (be they right, or wrong) have half undone me, who might otherwiſe have been as great a man as your ſelf is, or is like to be; but a full diet is thought not ſuitable for them, who are not full and compleat Conformiſts, as if in this caſe that maxime were true, *Malum è quolibet defectu, bonum non niſi ex cauſa integra.*

I am, and will be peaceable under *New Conformity* (though I can be no Zealot for it) but as for the *Articles of the Church*; (with othergiſe zeal than ever did *Jehu* pronounce theſe words, *Come ſee my zeal*,) I do tell you that I am willing to *Preach* them all over (as ſtrongly as I can) if God give life, and opportunity) to *Print* for them, yea (by Gods help) to *Die*, rather than to deny them. Having ſo ſaid, I appeal to Heaven, and Earth, whether upon a true account, I be not more a Conformiſt to the Church of *England*, than your ſelf. For though it may be truly ſaid that the craft of Subſcription, is as profitable to you as, making Shrines for *Diana* was to the Silver-Smiths, *Acts* 19. 25. by which craft, *&c.* (whilſt others have wofully ſmarted for not being ſuch profound Crafts-men at it) yet you do it ſo inſincerely, and inſignificantly, that I am confident many Non-Conformiſts could do it better by half, I mean, as to the moſt material parts of it, witneſs the manifeſt contradictions in your book to ſome conſiderable things which you have ſubſcribed Aſſent, and Conſent to, *&c.*

But Oh that I could get to the end of this tedious longſome Letter; wherein, amongſt other things, you will find one piece of modeſty, for your learning; *viz.* That I have therein concern'd but one man, mainly, and that is your ſelf the *Agreſſor*, and one more, leſs conſiderably, *viz.* an old Creditor of mine, in whoſe debt I have been ſeveral years, and particularly for his Printed Civilities towards my Wife, or rather ſlanderous

derous, and malicious rudeneſs, ſhe being a perſon of as great deſerts as moſt of her Sex, age, and quality, and one who had never provok'd him, nor he, I think, ſo much as ever ſaw her face, or ſhe his. I let all other men alone, and who are you ſtanding in oppoſition to the plain *Articles* of the Church of *England* that I ſhould fear to encounter you? Or who is that other perſon whom I now, and then, gently glance at, having committed ſuch rudeneſs towards my Wife, in Print, (whence I muſt denominate him a ſower of Diſcords in other mens families, at leaſtwiſe, *pro hic, & nunc*) as may ingage all the good Husbands, and all the Wives in *England*, to take my part againſt him, that I ſhould fear him? I fear him for nothing but becauſe what he ſaid of my Wife, was the inſinuation of a notorious untruth, though he brought it in with an *If*, *viz.* *If ſhe bite and ſcratch him every day*, &c. (for *If* is ſometimes a note of vehement aſſertion, *Numb.* 14. 23. compared with the Margent, and *Phil.* 2. 1. *If there be any Conſolation in Chriſt*, which is a note of *adjuring*, *As there is any*, &c.) Now if he have a *knack that way* (I mean, to ſuggeſt notorious Falſhoods with *Ifs*, and *Ands*) I know not what to ſay to him, *For there is no fenſe againſt a ſtale.* Good Wives are things of ſo near, and dear, and *comfortable Importance*, that no Man worthy of the name of a Husband will ſuffer them to be belied (eſpecially in Print) and not vindicate them, and make thoſe ſlanderers aſhamed of what they have ſaid.

If a Man may ſay upon any temporal provocation,

cation, *he do's well to be angry* (as *Jonah* ſaid) ſurely upon this when ſhe that is as the Apple of his Eye is ſcornfully touched, and that, (if any Earthly thing) will juſtifie an anger next in fierceneſs, to that in *Prov.* 6. 34. *which is ſaid to be the rage of a man, &c.*

Let the *Fr. Debater* ſerve me ſuch another dirty trick, in reference to her whom I have reaſon to love above any other Mortal, and by whom God has bleſt me with many Children that are very dear to me, if I do not make him repent it, without doing him any injuſtice (for a reaſon that I know) let me never be truſted.

As for thoſe numberleſs paſſages in which he hath ſhamefully abus'd, and wrong'd, my firſt, and immediate ſelf, in a Book of about three ſhillings price, conſiſting of little elſe but dirt, and ſcorn, thrown upon me (whom he knew to be a man nnder Hatches, and to have had ſorrow upon ſorrow, (as if he lov'd to *trample where the Hedge was low*, and to inſult over the afflicted) I ſay as for all thoſe I can eaſily paſs them by, though his whole Book againſt me had little elſe but ſuch things in it, ſaving a Diſcourſe upon the meaning of one Text (in the expounding whereof he follows one ſort of Authors, and I another, *viz.* concerning *the demonſtration of the Spirit, and of Power*) and a long harang to confute the *Primate* of *Armagh* his Notion about the word μυρια, which Reverend Mr. *Ranew* ſometimes Miniſter of *Felſtead*, hath told me once and again, he heard him deliver in a Sermon at St. *Maries*, above forty years ago, and I dare

ſay

ſay will teſtifie to the Debaters Face, though for quoting that paſſage of Biſhop *Uſhers* he gives me the lie (a Complement very frequent with him towards me (when God knows I did not deſerve it) which when cauſleſsly given, does always return, of courſe, upon them that gave it. A great man, (exactly of his own way) told me, that in his Anſwer to me, he did not look upon any thing worth his notice, but the expounding that Text, *about the demonſtration of the Spirit, and of Power*, and a laboured Diſcourſe about the word πομπαι. What ſhall we then think of all, or moſt of the reſt? 'Twas ſuch ſtuff that it is pity but the *Scavenger* had had it, and he takes as good every day off the Dung-hill. The Digreſſion which I have made concerning the *Fr. Debater* being all the Anſwer that ever I made him in Print to his empty, railing, ſcornful Book againſt me (therefore not worth the anſwering in a Book by its ſelf.) I ſay this digreſſion being all (ſaving a few other ſhort glances by the by) that ever I replied to a Book of his againſt me (containing above four hundred Pages of ſuch ſtuff as I told you) I hope I ſhall not be thought either ſplenetick, or tedious, for ſpending a few lines upon him (after ſeveral years forbearance,) to vindicate the neareſt Relation I have in the World, from a falſe aſperſion by him barbarouſly caſt upon her; both for that every Wife is under *Covert-baron*, as alſo that the Modeſty of her Sex permits her not to vindicate her ſelf ſo publickly, as unchriſtianly, ingentlely, and openly as ſhe has been wrong'd

by

by him, to whom I do not understand her to be in any thing inferiour, save in *Sex*, and the want of an University Education, which did not belong to her.

Having thus far vented my self in reference to my Wife, who is so dear to me that I have passed by a hundred affronts, and abuses put upon my self, rather than one, wherein she was concern'd, me-thinks I could now shake hands with the *Debater*, and be Friends (save that I suppose him not to be of a Nature so easily pacifiable) promising not to reflect upon him any more after this book, unless he, or some other acting, from, by, or under him, shall give me a new provocation thereunto.

Only by way of Caution to him for the future, tell the *Fr. Debater*, who has given me the unsufferable provocation aforesaid, that I have learn'd by comparing the *quotations* in his Book, *against the second Answer to the Fr. Debate* to take his counsel, *not to trust*, (no, not himself.) If men have the way of, those things, what shall we say?

It remaineth that as I have already shewed you in many particulars why your Book ought to be written against, so that I shew you in the next place, why I have taken that task upon my self, not but that I am sincerely conscious that there were many both *Conformists*, and *Non-Conformists*, disgusted at your Book, who were much abler to have answered it than was my self, particularly some of those who had fallen under you lash, and felt your Scorpions, I must say but

but ſome, becauſe ſome of them are, and were dead, when you wrote your Book, to encounter the quick, and the dead.

Neither do I pretend to have been importuned, either by a great or leſſer number of Perſons, diſſatisfied with your Book, to write againſt it: for I muſt confeſs (in reference to my own good, and ſafety, as was pretended) I was much more diſſwaded from, than perſwaded to it, ſo that I write not in a publick, but private capacity, not as a repreſentative of others, or a common Perſon, but in a ſingle capacity. I found *nitimur in vetitum* a little verified in me at this time, and have written this Book partly to aſſert that right that every man, who is *ſui juris*, ha's to govern his own Actions, and to thwart that humour of interpoſing in the affairs of other men, which is a kind of meaſure that I do hate to meet out to other folks, and do not love that others ſhould meet out to me. As I ſaid in and of my Anſwer to the Friendly Debate, ſo I ſay of this. It is no *Chedder-cheeſe*, but all of one Cowes milk, *&c.*

Therefore whatſoever you diſlike in this book blame no body but me for it. *In me convertito ferrum.* I had no *Sanhedrim* to counſel me (as the Book it ſelf will tell you,) yea, I had no *Second.* I had many to weaken my hands, but few to ſtrengthen them, or to encourage me, *&c.* I have been told again, and again, that I uſe to write *ſtans pede in nno*, with the greateſt ſuddenneſs, that any man can do, therefore you may be ſure. I can ſhew no Commiſſion, from any party

of men, to write, neither do I belong to any party whatsoever, but profess my self a hearty Lover of all good men, of all parties, and persuasions whatsoever, and do betwixt smiling and weeping (like *April* weather) many times behold and consider the little trifles, that men, like Children, do often quarrel about, and how they are at Daggers drawing, because to their apprehension, they are contradicted by those who really, and in good earnest do say one, and the same thing, and for having received the lye (as they suppose) from those who do but in other words confirm, and say over what they have spoken.

Now, Sir, If you would know what did move me to write against you (for I have already told you what did not) I shall give you the following account of my so doing. I did it partly to divert my self after ten Moneths spent in, and under a severe melancholy, occasioned by such a confluence of disasters, as would have discomposed any man, for the time being, I say I have written (seeing you were to be written against) to divert, and refresh my self, after I had been so long in that House of Bondage (for to vindicate truth, and give check to Youthful Pride, and arrogance, is one of the best recreations I can have.)

If the three surviving Divines whom you have greatly concern'd in your Book, *viz.* Dr. *O.* Dr. *J.* or Mr. *W.* they, or any of them, would have stoopt so low, as to have answered a Person so much younger, and less experienced in Religion

gion than themſelves, I wouldnot have medled with you (for I did inquire into their minds as to that before I began) but poſſibly they (as many others) did think it beneath them, to ſet their Age, and Wit, againſt yours, to encounter a *Novice*, *puff'd in mind*. Poſſibly they thought ſuch a *Worm* as I, might ſerve to wither ſuch a *gourd* as you, that were but of yeſterday. Why ſhould any of them ſet himſelf wholly, and intirely, againſt your ſingle ſelf, who had thought each of them worthy of, but a *fifth*, or *ſeventh* part of your ſtrength, to be at once ingaged againſt him? and for all *five* ſurvivers, to have joyn'd their heads againſt you, had been as cowardly, and deſpicable an enterprize, as for your *ſtripling-Age* to ſet its ſelf againſt *five* of them, all at once, was bold and daring, and *Hector* like in you. Sir, I think you have leſs reaſon to take it ill that I ſhould write againſt you than any man elſe, becauſe I preſume you have not forgotten that a few years ſince you told me with ſome eagerneſs, that if the *Fr. Debater* did not anſwer *Philagathus*, by ſuch a time, you would do it. Now I humbly conceive it may as well become my Age, and ſtanding, to anſwer a Book of yours, and to Correct the *Errata*, which *I* ſeem to find in it, as yours to do the like by a Book of mine. *I* may not forbear to tell you how highly culpable your Book is (if there had been nothing elſe to have render'd it ſo,) upon the account of the *unſeaſonableneſs* of it. Wot you not, Sir, that now is, and then was, a Critical time, betwixt *P.*

teſtants, and *Papiſts*, each wreſtling a fall with other, and ſtrugling as it were for Life, as who ſhould ſay, *now or never*, to *make a bolt or a ſhot of it*. And was this a time for you to ſhoot your haſty bolt at peaceable Proteſtant diſſentors, who would have joyn'd with you hand in hand, with all their hearts, to have laid *Popery* upon its back, and to have given it ſo fair a fall that it ſhould never riſe again?

Miſtake not your ſelf as if ſome of them were not as able to aſſiſt in that work as moſt of you are, and you cannot be ignorant of that old ſaying, *Vis unita fortior*. You may ſee your error er'e you die, in rejecting their help, who would have ſtood in that gap as well as you (and might have done as good Service.)

Would you offer to divert ſo happy a *Criſis*, as we did hope to have ſeen if inſtead of *fighting* either *againſt great or ſmall*, diſſenting *Proteſtants*, at ſuch a time as this, we had fought only againſt our common Adverſaries the *Papiſts*, and laboured to ſecure *England* againſt the fear of our being invaded by their Religion in any ſucceeding Age.

His Holineſs may con you many thanks for your Book, for you tim'd it as punctually to do him ſervice by turning the edge of Diſſentors from him, upon your ſelf, as if you had leſs love for your ſelf, than for him. You might have learn'd of the *Proteſtants* in *Ireland*, who being always jealous, and fearful of the Papiſts, which dwell amongſt them, have as few bickerings about their preter-fundamental perſwaſions, as you

you have known in any Church. To deal with one ſo potent Enemy as the Papiſts are, at one time, is fair.

We could have all agreed in the *unum tertium*, to have ſecur'd the Proteſtant Religion to our ſelves, and our Poſterity, but it was your pleaſure to find us other work to do. If words ſpoken in ſeaſon, be *like apples of Gold in pictures of ſilver*, yours ſeem like crabs of lead, in pictures of ruſty Iron, and you your ſelf like one (for want of a milder ſimilitude at hand) that ſhould have attemped to ſet the Suburbs on fire, when the City was ſo, that the Inhabitants thereof might be at no leiſure to aſſiſt in quenching the City. The leaſt that can be made of your publiſhing ſuch a Book at ſuch a time is, that if you be no friend to Papiſts, yet you are a greater enemy to Non-Conformiſts, than to them, though I muſt tell you that the difference betwixt Orthodox Conformiſts, and ſome Non-conformiſts is ſo very ſmall, with reference to any danger that can be ſuppoſed from thence, either to Church, or Kingdome, or to the ſouls of men, that *Shibboleth*, and *Sibboleth*, are not neerer in ſound. I confeſs that betwixt your ſelf and all Orthodox Non-Conformiſts, yea and Conformiſts too, there is a *great gulph fixed*, that there is no paſſing from one to the other, becauſe you have taken away the bridge, of ſome of the Articles of our Church, that golden bridge, which would have brought them over to you. How can I chuſe but charge you with great cruelty, and being like the bloody, and inſatiable *Horſe-*

Leech, which *never ſaith*, *It is enough?* Have hundreds of Non-Conformiſts ſuffer'd deeply above ten years together, who never had a hand in the ſufferings of other men, but were as kind to them in the time of their calamity as they could be, and do you ſay that it is not enough?

Have not eleven, or twelve books been written againſt them already? *viz. Four Fr. Debates*, &c. and muſt you needs make them up a *Bakers douzen?*

Are you not Brother to *Simeon* and *Levi?* of whom it ia ſaid, *Curſed be their anger for it was fierce, and their wrath for it was cruel*, and namely becauſe they ſlew the *Shecemites* when they were ſore with Circumciſion, and unable to help themſelves, Did the good *Samaritan* when he found a man that was *rob'd*, *wounded*, and *half dead* kill him outright? Was that Souldier to be imitated who ran his Spear you know into whoſe ſide whilſt he was upon the Croſs? I confeſs that our Saviour was worth ten thouſand of us, him, *a longè ſequimur, & veſtigia prorſus adoramus*, but if he reckon what is done to his members, as done to himſelf, I doubt you have done ſome ſuch thing. Men of ſuch good lives, and of ſo good learning, and great uſefulneſs, as you have ſcorn'd, and expos'd, ſo many at once, (for you deſign through the ſides of the *ſeven* mentioned, to wound all the reſt of their way, and character) were I think never ſcorn'd and abuſed at that rate, as you, and ſome others have abus'd them, by men of the ſame kind of education with themſelves, that ſuck'd (as I may

ſay)

ſay) the ſame milk with themſelves. For I muſt tell you, the greateſt wounds that Non-Conformiſts have received, have been in the houſes, and from the hands of their ſometimes friends, and of ſuch as *went out from them*; which implies they were ſometimes ſeemingly of them. I could not find in my heart to write a book to vilifie, and expoſe ſuch of the Clergy (as alas there are ſome ſuch) as are greatly *ignorant*, and *debauch'd*, (no not any one of them, as ſuch) ſurely then you had a heart of braſs, yea *triplex æs circa pectus*, that could abuſe a generation of men, many of which, by your own confeſſion, are of excellant good lives, and ſome of them, you know in your conſcience, to be very good Scholars: and to do it at a time when you know that many Non-Conformiſts have little elſe to ſubſiſt by, but ſome intereſt in the eſteem, and affections of good people, and the effects, and reſults of that, which God knows, as to many of them, is very hard commons.

Whoſoever goes about to fix the ſufferings of peaceable Diſſentors upon them, and to make their bands ſtronger, and faſter, (by miſrepreſenting them) even whilſt you know that our Rulers have often debated concerning the looſing and ſlacking of them; doth, and ſhall thereby highly provoke God, who hateth *cruelty*, where pity, and compaſſion ought to be ſhewed, greatly ſin againſt his Brerhren, and their innocent, Families (whoſe miſeries will cry to heaven againſt him) and ſin againſt the Church of God, and ſouls of men, which do even groan, till divers

of them (whoſe labours have been, and might be of much uſe in ſuch places where good preaching is not) be reſtor'd to the full exerciſe of their publick Miniſtry.

Now I conſtrue all ſuch books as yours, as if it had been ſaid in ſo many words; The outed N. C. Miniſters are all, or the generality of them, a generation of men that do underſtand neither ſouud Divinity, nor Common Senſe; but ſtudy to amuſe, and pleaſe the people with Enthuſiaſtical Notions, and Antinomian Errors, ſoothing them up in their ſins, ſo that their preaching would do more hurt than good, and therefore let the reſtoring of them never be taken into conſideration, as being no more worth while, than to take a body out of the grave which is not only dead, but rotten, and ready to poyſon us with the ſtanch thereof. But how falſe a charge that is, there is a God above that knows, and that the generality of them are not inferiour to the generality of your ſelves, ſaving in *Riches*, *Dignities*, and *exemption from Scruples*.

Sir, You could only pick up the old darts and ſhoot them over again at the N. C. for the whole Quiver was emptied before you began, and there was nothing that was ſubſtantially new left for you to alledge againſt them You did but lick up the vomit of others, and vomit it up again in the faces of the N. C. If we think thoſe young men cruel, who when they ſee a poor Cock at *Shrovetide*, that has received a great many blows, even quite ſpent, and ready to tumble down, will fling at him again, as hard as they

can

can drive, and that not with a disign to kill him out right, but to make more sport with him: I say if we think them cruel, what must we think of you? Are not N. C. of more value than many Cocks? as well as than many Sparrows? and yet so you serve them; as if nothing would satisfie you unless you could see their necks rung off, & why, I beseech you, what have they done? or what good cannot many of them do, that you can do? I dare say if they were worse men, and less considerable, they would not meet with half that opposition that they have done from you. I am as confident as I am at any thing (and your manner of writing assures me of it) that *Envy* is at the bottum, that *Coloquintida*, that death, is at *the bottome of the pot*, &c.

And now, Sir, if you desire, or need to have your memory relieved, in such a case as this, by Recapitulation of what has been said, I shall give you a Rehersal of the heads of that Charge which has been justly exhibited against you, which are as followeth. *Viz.*

1. That you have poured out abundance of scorn upon several that are, and were, your Superiours in *Age*, *Degree*, *Name*, *Experience*, *Learning*, *Parts*, and *Goodness*: 'tis so obvious that I shall not name them.

2. You have derided Acquaintance with the Person of Christ, both name, and thing, above forty times, in the first 140 pages of your Book.

3. You have borne False-witness against your Brethren in representing as if they did beat off men

men from Acquaintance with the Laws, and Gospel of our Saviour, and put them upon acquainting themselves (which I never heard, or read that man that did) solely, and only with his Person.

You have written at a wild rate concerning *Union*, and *Communion with God*, and the *Imputation of Christs Righteousness* to Believers, as one that knew not what he said, and whereof he did affirm.

5. You have in heat of blood trespassed now and then upon *Common Sense*, making good that saying; *Perit omne judicium cum abit in affectus.*

Of that I have given but one Instance as yet, *viz.* your saying *p.* 4. *That Christ is originally, the name of an Office, which the Jews call a Messiah, or one anointed by God* (though your self doth own an *Office*, and an *Officer*, to be two different things, and differently intended by you, by what you write *p.* 8. *Though Christ be Originally the name of an Office, yet it is used in Scripture to signifie the Person who is invested with this Office.* Now that Christ is over and above his being invested with an Office, or Offices, the *Office*, or *Offices* themselves, is so disagreeable to sense, as if one should say of a wise man, that he was not only indowed with Wisdome, but Wisdome it self, or a good man, that he were goodness it self, or a Rich man, that he were Riches themselves, *&c.* But to let that pass, there is another instance of incurable Non-sense to be found in *p.* 6. *l.* 2. *Christ was a Priest after the order*

order of Melchizedec, *who was King of* Salem (*the* New-Jeruſalem *that comes down from Heaven.*) was that *Melchizedec* who was a Type of Chriſt King of the *New Jeruſalem* which comes down from heaven? Was not *Salem* the name of that place on earth, which was afterwards called *Jeruſalem*, from the word *Jireh* put to *Salem*, becauſe there Gods providence was ſeen, *Gen.* 22 whereof *Melchiſedech* was literally King? *Gen.* 14. I thought the *new Jeruſalem coming down from heaven*, ſpoken of, *Rev.* 3. 12. and 21. 2. had been the Church triumphant: Was that *Melchiſedec* King of the Church triumphant? If ſo, he was Chriſt himſelf. And then it will follow, that Chriſt was a type of himſelf, for *Melchiſedec* was a type of Chriſt, ſo the type and antitype were both one. I fancy you were betwixt ſleeping and waking when that myſtical paſſage fell from your pen. Again, your confounding the Offices of Chriſt ſo as you do, p. 5. and 6. looks like bad ſenſe, as well as bad Theology. *His preaching the Goſpel*, (ſay you) *was the exerciſe of his Regal power*; why not of his *Prophetical*? Does it belong to Kings, as ſuch, to preach, any more than to Prophets or Miniſters, as ſuch, to act as Kings? Whereas you ſay, that his preaching was *the publiſhing of his Laws*, that is true too, but the publiſhing of Laws in ones own perſon, is no exerciſe of Regal power; for though Kings do make Laws, yet they do not uſe to proclaim, or publiſh them themſelves, but leave that to their ſervants thereunto appointed. Moreoxer, you ſay, *When Chriſt offered himſelf*

himſelf a ſacrifice for ſin, he acted like a King, p. 9. It uſeth to be ſaid, that Chriſt in offering himſelf a ſacrifice, acted as a *Prieſt*: for it did not belong to Kings, as Kings, to offer ſacrifice; Witneſs *Uzziah*, 2 *Chron.* 26, 18, 19. Chriſt did not die in purſuance or diſcharge of his *Kingly*, but of his *Prieſtly* Office; witneſs *Heb.* 8. 3. *Every High Prieſt is ordained to offer gifts and ſacrifices, wherefore it is of neceſſity that this man alſo have ſomething to offer*; viz. as he was High Prieſt: See alſo *Heb.* 7. 26. *For ſuch a high-prieſt became us, who needed not daily to offer ſacrifice firſt for his own ſins, and then for the peoples: for this he did once, when he offer'd up himſelf.* See alſo *Heb.* 9. 11. 12. *Chriſt being come a high prieſt, by his own bloud entred in once into the holy place*, viz. as High prieſt he did ſo. 'Tis no leſs ſtrange than the former, that you ſhould ſay, *That to which we commonly attribute the name of Regal power, is called his Interceſſion.* Did it belong to Kings, as Kings, to *intercede* for the people? Atonement was made for the people under the O. T. not only by offering of a ſacrifice, but by taking the bloud thereof, and preſenting that with prayers and interceſſions unto God to accept of it for the ſins of the people, *Levit.* 16. After the ſacrifice was kill'd, the Prieſt was to take the bloud of it, and ſprinkle it with his finger on the mercy ſeat, and he was to cauſe a cloud of incence to ariſe on the mercy-ſeat, which was a Type of the Prayers and Interceſſions of Jeſus Chriſt. 'Tis ſaid of Chriſt, *Heb.* 8. 4. that, *if he were on earth, he ſhould not be a Prieſt*, that is, as in the times of the

the O. T. if the Prieſt had only offered a ſacrifice, and had not gone into the Holy of Holies with the bloud thereof, ſprinkling the mercy-ſeat, praying and interceding that it might be accepted for the ſins of the people, he had not been a compleat Prieſt, ſo ſaith the Apoſtle, If Chriſt had only offer'd up himſelf here a ſacrifice, and had not gone into Heaven, and carried the virtue of his death thither, to pray and *intercede* for us, he had not done the work of the great High Prieſt. Alſo compare *Heb.* 9. 11, 12. with the 24. ver. and ſee if making interceſſion for us be not aſcribed to Chriſt, not as a King, but as a High prieſt. Alſo *Heb.* 11. 24. *But this man hath an unchangeable prieſthood, wherefore he is able to ſave to the uttermoſt, ſeeing he ever liveth (viz.* as an unchangeable prieſt) *to make interceſſion for us.*

By theſe Inſtances you may ſee how nonſenſically you have confounded the Offices of Chriſt, and would make as if he had done every thing as a *King*, or in diſcharge of his Kingly Office, what did he then as a *Prieſt?*, or Prophet? you might almoſt as well have ſaid that our bodies do hear as they have *eyes*, or ſee by vertue of their *ears*, as that Chriſt did offer Sacrifice as a King, and not ſo much as he was a Prieſt; and Preach not ſo much by vertue of his Prophetical, as his Regal Office; and enter into the Holieſt to make *interceſſion* for us as a *King*, rather than as a High-Prieſt. Every work of Chriſt ought to be aſcribed to that Office of his, to which it is moſt directly, and properly reducible:

cible: as every duty ought to be reduced to that Commandment to which it moſt immediately belongs; elſe we ſhall make all the offices of Chriſt and all the duties of Chriſtians, run one into another, and be in effect but one, and the ſame. Now I am ſure that Chriſt his offering of Sacrifice, and interceding for us, are works moſt properly, and immediately belonging to him, and done by him as a *Prieſt*. I hope by this time you ſee your error in that particular, and conſequently that the acts of Chriſt his Kingly power, in *Governing his Church, diſpenſing his Grace, and ſupernatural aſſiſtances, Judging the World*, &c. are not to be called his *Interceſſion*, for that belongs to him directly, and properly as *Prieſt*, and not as *King*: For ſo the Scripture uſeth to ſpeak, as hath been ſhewn. The ſum of this Paragraph is, that I do very much doubt how what you haye written about the Offices of Chriſt can be reconciled to *Common Senſe*, which inſtances, (with the two former) may ſuffice to prove the fifth Article in my Charge againſt you, *viz.* that you have fallen below good ſenſe in ſome of your expreſſions.

6. You have taken occaſion from ſome few paſſages in certain Books (which have done much good, and might have done more) to bring both them and their Authors under great contempt, whereas many of the paſſages alledged by you, did onely want a grain or two of Salt, or of Charity, to make them paſs for currant, and others, ſaving as you have captiouſly conſtrued them, might have paſſed very well without any

one

one grain of allowance; and to be ſure in the *Fathers* there are many expreſſions which were altogether as liable to your cenſure) yet uſe not to be cenſured) as moſt of thoſe which you have expoſed. What is this but to *bite and devour*, which they that do, muſt expect to be *bitten and devoured*; *for what meaſure men meet to others, the ſame*, &c. When N Cs. invite great ſinners to come in to Chriſt, promiſing them mercy, you malitiouſly conſtrue their words *in ſenſu compoſito*, as if they told them, that they continuing ſuch, might find mercy, though they alwayes meant it *in ſenſu diviſo*, viz. that *if the wicked forſake his way he ſhall find mercy*. You make as if exhorting men to *truſt* in Chriſt, or *reſt on* Chriſt, were to exhort them to *preſume*, whereas no man doth truly truſt in Chriſt, but he that *feareth the Lord, and obeyeth the voice of his ſervant*, as it is *Iſa.* 50. 10. as no man truſteth to a Phyſician for his cure, who doth not follow his preſcriptions, becauſe he gives him no hope of a cure, but in the uſe of thoſe means.

Though to criticize upon thoſe Books which are *critically, captiouſly*, and *cenſoriouſly* written, be but a juſt retaliation, and fair play, becauſe they who have ſo written, may be preſumed to have ſtood upon their guard (as confcious they have provok'd others ſo to deal with them, and deſerved no leſs,) yet to write in that manner againſt pious, practical, devotional Books, written by the Authors thereof in the godly ſimplicity of their hearts, for the uſe of vulgar people, and to bring every *ſimilee*, & a popular expreſſion there-

in,

in, to a philoſophical teſt and ſcrutiny, is ſo unchriſtian, yea ſo unjuſt, and uncivil, ſo *common barreter*-like, (that quarrels with every body for nothing,) as nothing can be more, and doth prepare the way to turn all Devotion, or devotional Books, into ſcorn, and ridicule. And though to write in a biting, and cutting ſtile, when no provocation is given thereunto, be to do like *Hectors*, who draw upon thoſe that walk peaceably about the ſtreets, yet to do ſome ſuch thing in anſwer to thoſe who have whet their pens like ſwords or raſors, and drawn upon thoſe that never medled with them, is but to ſerve them in their kind, to draw in our own defence, and in caſe the aggreſſor ſhall come by any harm, he may thank himſelf, as thoſe fooliſh people may, who when all was quiet before, would needs be conjuring, (not that I think you any Conjurer, ſtrain not my ſimilitude too far) and raiſing ſuch ſpirits as they could not tame.

7. You have taken as little notice of the *Articles* and *Homilies*, (and otherwiſe declared ſenſe) of the Church of *England*, (and ſwitch't and ſpurr'd up againſt them as confidently, when they ſtood in the way of your errors) as *Balaam* did of the Angel, which confronted, and oppos'd him, with a drawn ſword in his hand, even till *the dumb aſſe ſpeaking with man's voice, forbad the madneſs of that Prophet*, 2 Pet. 2. 16.

8. You have broken the faith of your *Preface*, put into *ſheeps clothing*, (and pretending no leſs innocency to enſue,) by your book's coming forth like *a ravening Wolf*.

9. You

9. You have outbraved all that went before you, by putting down your own, and the names of as many as you did expreſly write againſt, in words at length, which doth abundantly aſſure me, that you have a *mouth*, in the ſenſe that *Cicero* meant it, when he ſaid of one, *Illi os eſt*, thongh that you are but the *mouth* (or at all the mouth) of others, who approve the ſame things that you have written (whatſoever ſome have ſaid) I am very loath to believe it, and do think in charity I ought not, unleſs I could ſee ſomething for it like a demonſtration, and then, and not till then, will I think you like *the cat, whoſe foot was made uſe of, to pull the Cheſnut out of the fire*.

10. You have frequently ſcoff'd at a way of teaching and explaining things, than which there is none more common in the holy Scriptures, even in the Sermons of our Saviour, *viz.* by *Similitudes*. I could not but think of you, as I was reading that paſſage of Chriſt to his Spouſe, *Cant.* 1. 9. *I have compar'd thee, O my love, to a company of horſes in Pharaoh's chariot*, what work you would have made with ſuch a compariſon as that, had you not found it in holy Writ. You would have ſaid, it may be, that becauſe reaſonable creatures have but two feet apiece, they ought not to be compared to horſes that have have four, and inſiſted upon the vaſt diſparities which are betwixt men and horſes, in other reſpects. A great part of your book had been ſpared, but for the advantage taken by proper ſimilitudes, that did not run (as ſcarce one in the

Bible do's) upon all four, &c. But take heed how you teach the Holy Ghoſt to ſpeak, or deride men for imitating of Scripture Rhetorick.

Again, You have done great wrong to your brethren, by bearing the world in hand, as if they did make uſe of *Similies* for *Arguments* and *Demonſtrations*, whereas it is well known, that they do bring them meerly for *Illuſtration*. Yea, you deride thoſe ſimilitudes in their writings, the ſame with which are found in the writings of Biſhop *Morton*, p. 630. and Biſhop *Davenant* and others. which had you known to have been their ſimilees, I think you would not have taken the boldneſs to have pronounced them ridiculous. I could tell you out of the incomparable Mr. *Mede*, a ſimilie of his much more expoſable, than moſt that you have expoſed, yet who has the face to expoſe him for it?

11. You have greatly violated the Law of your worthy education, and been like a bullock that had ſhaken off the yoke.

12. You have given great cauſe of ſuſpicion both from your book, and the Sermon of yours which you juſtified in a Letter, herein recited, that you ſcarce believe the Doctrine of *Original ſin*, and if ſo, I muſt tell you, that errour of yours is, *Vitium primæ concoctionis quod non corrigitur in ſecunda neque in tertia*, and an abſurdity, which put, a thouſand more will follow upon it. The ſlight thoughts you have of *Original ſin*, as expoſing men only to *temporal* miſeries, not to *eternal* death, may be gathered from

from theſe words of yours, p. 333. *God was ſo highly diſpleaſed with* Adams *ſin, that he entail'd a great many evils, and miſeries, and death its ſelf upon his poſterity for his ſake.* This is all that you ſeem to underſtand by thoſe words, *Rom.* 5. 18, 19. *By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation:* and *By one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners.* By your gloſs upon that text, you ſeem to think that neither *Adams* eating of the forbidden fruit, is imputed to us, nor yet any corruption of nature by him derived to us, and entailed upon us, but only *miſery*, and *calamity*, and that but *temporal* neither; for you ſpeak of death as the very extremity and utmoſt of it, meaning *temporal* death ſurely, for you ſay not a word of *eternal*, whereas the ninth Article of our Church ſaith, that *Original ſin deſerveth Gods wrath, and eternal damnation.* You ſpeak of God as diſpleaſed only with *Adams* ſin, and as puniſhing his poſterity only *for his ſake*, as if God did not ſee us to be ſinners, either *Imputatively*, by the imputation of *Adams* firſt ſin, ἐφ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, *in whom have all ſinned*, or *inherently*, by reaſon of the corruption of our own natures derived from him (whereas they who own *Original Sin*, generally hold both) upon the account of both which God is diſpleaſed with our ſelves, and puniſheth us for our own ſakes. You will find it hard to ſatisfie your reaſon, how if we were innocent as to *Adams* firſt ſin, and were not made ſinful by the infection thereof, God ſhould juſtly puniſh us for another mans ſake (not as he puniſhed Chriſt who offered himſelf voluntarily

rily thereunto, but againſt our wills and conſents) as alſo to ſhew what ſo great need we had of Chriſt, if by *Original ſin*, we were expos'd only to temporal miſery, and death, which we undergo in our own perſons, at leaſtwiſe how ſuch as die in *Infancy*, are beholden to Chriſt, who according to you were never liable to eternal death.

13. Woe be to the Text of a Non-Conformiſts Book, that has your comment upon it, for though take it litterally, and plainly, it be good ſenſe, yet it ſhall go hard but you before you have done will make *Non-ſenſe* of it, or ſomething elſe as bad, or worſe than *Non-ſenſe*.

14. You have ventured now, and then, upon as bold and daring expreſſions, as the hardieſt man that ever *I* read, witneſs that of *God's being glutted with the Blood of his Son* (which *I* believe no man ever ſaid before you,) and the following paſſages, which out-braves that, *viz.* (Sh. p. 47.) *That God is full of Love and Patience, when he hath taken his fill of Revenge, as others uſe to ſay, that the Devil is very Good when he is pleaſed.*

15. You have tim'd your Book the worſt that could be, *viz.* ſo as to divert Proteſtant diſſenters, when they ſhould be helping of you with all their might againſt Papiſts, or rather Popery, and to caſt them off in the very heat of the battle. 16. You have ſhewed your mercies to be cruelties, by coming down with great rage upon your old Friends, the *Non-Conformiſts*, when you ſaw them before like the man at the beginning of ſome Almanacks, all ſtuck with darts, from head

head to foot, when others had distilled off all their wits upon them till there was nothing left but a *Caput mortuum* for you to work upon. *I* know one who is of the mind that that dreadful passage in *Mat.* 23. 35. may with too much truth, be turn'd upon those who have done as you have done, but *I* am loath to be so severe.

16. You have contradicted and derided the Orthodox sayings of worthy men in some of the highest points of Religion, which if you meant as they mean, only would word it otherwise, was great peevishness, and perverseness in you to do, but if you thought their scope, and sense, and meaning (such as their words did sufficiently express) to be wrong, *I* dare say you are rotten at core, and one of those that do deny the first, and main principles, against whom, it is hardly worth while to dispute. Read with an aking heart, and (if it could be) with tears of blood, what harmless, and holy passages out of Mr. *Watson's* Book of *Christ* his *loveliness* you have bitterly derided, *p.* 69, 70, 71, 72. also *p.* 112, 113. (to omit others) scorn them over again if you dare. *I* say read what you have there written, blush and tremble. But especially read *p.* 139, and 140 of your Book.

17. You have written so hetrodoxly about the great point of Justification, and the imputation of our Saviours Righteousness, that *I* doubt not but to produce more Orthodox sayings out of Popish writters concerning those matters, and in pleading for Justification by works you seem to have given away a great part (if not one half)

of our Protestant Religion.

18. You have bid fair for *Socinianism* in some passages of your Book (if Natural Consequences and Inferences may be allow'd.)

But *I* fore-see what your refuge will be, *viz.* that you have several passages in your Book which no *Socinian* will allow of, *viz.* touching the *satisfaction* of Christ, &c. *I* grant that too. But if you will contradict your self (as you frequently do) who can help it. If you will deny *imputed Righteousness*, you must needs deny *Christs Satisfaction*, for how come believers to be interessed in the Satisfaction of Christ, and the benefits thereof otherwise than by God's imputing it to them, or accepting of it on their behalf, or reckoning them, in, and by Christ, their surety (though not in their own Persons) to have satisfied Divine Justice? Mr. *Perkins* in his *Reformed Catholick*, p. 52, & 93. wonders at the Papists, and counts it unreasonable in them, to deny the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, sith they own his Satisfaction. I am sure, Sir, your words had need be wholesome, for you often *eat them*, say, and unsay, grant, and deny, give and take, reel and stagger like a sceptical man that did not know his own mind, unless you have done it in pollicy, like the *Badger*, which opens sometimes one Window in her shell, sometimes the contrary, according as the Sun and the cold wind do sit, to injoy the one, and avoid the other, or like those Families in the time of War, who fought, as it were *by consent*, part of them, on the *Kings-side*, and part

on

on the other ſide, that ſo they might ſave their ſtakes by their Alliance, which ſide ſoever ſhould prevail. But for matter of contradicting your ſelf (than whom, you may contradict no man more freely) I ſhall leave you to what puniſhment you ſhall think fit to impoſe upon your ſelf, concerning my ſelf only with thoſe paſſages in which you contradict founder men than your ſelf.

And whilſt you have made it your work to deſtroy that Divinity, which by the bleſſing of God upon it, made others very good, you have taken care that no Divinity, (I mean contained in your Book) ſhould be entertained in the room of it, becauſe *Scorn* and *Drollery*, is no vehicle by which to convey Religion into men, and where they ſee thoſe *Cloven-feet*, they will never believe it is an Angel of Light, but rather of Darkneſs, that preſents its ſelf to them, and courts their acceptance.

19. You ſeem to have given us upon the matter a new Syſtem, and Scheme of Divinity, though not new to the World, yet to the Church of *England*, and the grave reverend Divines thereof.

20. Your Book is pointed and edg'd againſt that ſort of men which, not I, but the great Mr. *Hooker* (Author of the admired Eccleſiaſtical Policy in *p.* 50. Folio) tells the World are in their private and perſonal capacity, as good People as are in the World.

That great Mr. *Hooker* his words are theſe, *Yea, I am perſwaded that of them with whom in this cauſe we ſtrive, there are whoſe betters amongſt men*

would be hardly found, if they did live in ſome Wilderneſs by themſelves. Hookers Eccl Pol. l. 1. p 50. This Character, that mighty Or[illegible] of the *Old Puritans*, and verily if Mr. *Hildersham*, Mr. *Dod*, and ſuch like, be (as ſurely they are) to be reckoned of that ſort of men, (bating thoſe ſcruples which *I* dare ſay they could not help) than ſuch as they *I* believe the World has ſcarce had better men ſince the great Worthies Recorded in Scripture. *I* ſay, if we dare but allow them a few grains for their *Non-Conformity*, they were ſuch and ſo excellent Perſons, as *I* have ſaid, or rather as Mr. *Hooker* hath ſaid, which paſſage *I* put in, to let you know that *I* have not taken upon me to juſtifie any thing that is againſt Law, or to judge the Law, but have only juſtified their Perſons, as to other things, who have ſcrupled ſome few preter-fundamental things that were injoyn'd by Eccleſiaſtical Laws, as not knowing there is any Law in *England* that forbids us to ſay that a *Non-Conformiſt* is an honeſt, peaceable man, and a good Scholar, if he be ſo indeed (any more than that a ſpade is a ſpade) or that allows you to ſay of a *Non Conformiſt*, becauſe ſuch, that he is a *Dunce*, and does not write ſenſe, when the World knows him to be a man of conſiderable parts, and Learning, as might be Dr. *J. O.* or Dr. *T. J.* What think you Mr. *Hildersham*, or Mr. *Dod* would have ſaid to your Book both as to the *matter* and *manner* of it if they had been alive? They would no ſooner have taſted, but ſpit it out again, finding it as contrary to the

Principles,

Principles, and Spirit of *Old Puritans* (with whom, I care not who knows, I wiſh my Soul when I come to dye, believing what Mr. *Hooker* ſaid of them,) as a book can be. One had wont to ſay, There was the *Knave-Puritan* (or one that was but Hypocritically ſuch) and the *Knave's-Puritan*. As for the latter of the the two, 'twere better that a Mil ſtone were hung about your neck, than that in word or writing you ſhould perſecute one that is ſuch. Yea, I dare ſay that you thought your ſelf, twelve years agoe, to be ſo far from doing any ſuch thing that if one had then told you, that in the year 1674, you would publiſh a jearing book againſt ſo holy a man as was Mr. *Shepheard* (and ſome others ſuch as he) you would have ſaid, as *Hazael* did, 2 *Kings* 8. 13. *But what is thy Servant a Dog, that he ſhould do this great thing?*

21. 'Tis a ſmall matter to tell you that you do *involare in manes*, or that you have not ſpared the dead (though that be inhumane and barbarous) compared with your greater Crime in affronting, and contradicting the Living *Church of England*, yea (as I have proved) in effect, and by Conſequence, *unchurch'd the Church of England*, as charging it with great, and *fundamental* Errors which might eaſily be diſcern'd and avoided.

22. You have troubled the World with a Book, in which is neither any new *Truth*, nor any new *Error*, but ſome of the groſſer ſort of *Socinian*, or *Popiſh* Errors about *Original ſin*, *Juſtification*, &c. revived, and trim'd up with freſh

freſh *Scorn* or *Calumny*, which kind of writing is the way to keep the Waters of the Church alwayes troubled, which will be good for none, but them that love to fiſh in troubled Waters. 23. You have, as it were, rowled a ſtone over the Graves of the civilly dead Non-Conformiſts, that they might never be taken up again, with reſpect, and kindneſs, repreſenting them as a generation of Preachers fit for little but to fill the Pulpits, and the Ears and Heads of their Hearers with pleaſing Errors, and plauſible non-ſenſe, and in ſo doing have done what in you lay to prevent the labours of many, who by their Preaching have done God more Service than I believe you ever yet did (whatever you may do hereafter.)

24. You have expreſt a greater reſpect and candour towards a ſort of men, more like Devils incarnate than like men, *viz.* the *Debauchees of this Age* (and this Age hath ſome of that name as diabolical as ever any Age had) I ſay you have ſpoken more favourably of them than of a ſort of weak, but ſincere Chriſtians, who are much in complaining of the Corruption of our Natures, and wickedneſs of our hearts, (which when God opens your eyes to ſee what is in your Book, I doubt not but you will do your ſelf.)

Now ſome of the fore-mentioned Articles of your charge, I have inlarg'd upon already, as much as is needful, others it may ſuffice barely to mention, but ſome of the moſt conſiderable you muſt expect to find inlarg'd upon in the following

lowing Treatiſe. I believe you had never written what you have, but that you have either not read the Writings of *Puritan* Divines, to any purpoſe, or becauſe you have read them for no other purpoſe, but to carp at, and quibble upon them. If what you have written doth go for Salt, many wiſe, and good men do think it has loſt all its ſavour, and is fit for nothing but to be caſt out, &c.

I could tell you of a great and excellent man who was pleas'd to compare your book to a ſtack of Wheat, which though it did look well as it lay together, yet when opened, and ſpread, in order unto being thraſht out, was found ſo full of Snakes, Serpents, and Toads, that the owner is forced to ſet it on fire, and burn both it and them together. One while he would ſay, Here is a Serpent, another while there is a Snake, but now and then, *nay*, but *Here is a Toad*.

Yea, I could tell you of a greater man than him I laſt mentioned, one highly dignified by his degree in the Church of *England*, but more by his ſoundneſs in the Faith, who (as I am credibly inform'd) hath ſaid, that a great part of St. *Paul's* Epiſtle to the *Romans*, might as well have been expoſed by you as ſome paſſages that you have exſpoſed. Moreover 'tis ſaid that one of the reverend *Profeſſors* of Divinity in *Oxford* doth now and then chaſtiſe you in his Lectures for your Book, notwithſtanding the Proverb, *Aquila non capit muſcas*.

For my own part, I think in my Conſcience if your eyes ſhould be opened to ſee your ſelf in the Glaſs

Glaſs & Mirrour of your Book, as you are there repreſented ſo *proud*, ſo *ſcornful*, ſo *envious*, ſo *quarrelſome*, ſo *immodeſt*, ſo *erroneous*, and ſome will ſay ſo *profane*, at leaſtwiſe as many do take it, it would be matter of humiliation, and ſelf-abaſing to you all the dayes of your life, and make you fear to take a Pen in your hand to write another controverſial Book.

What *Solomon* directs in another caſe, is I think as good advice as can be rendered you under your preſent Circumſtances, only *mutatis mutandis*, Prov. 6. 1. and ſo onwards. *My Son if thou be ſurety for thy Friend, thou art ſnared with the words of thy mouth, thou art taken with the words of thy mouth. Do this now my Son, and deliver thy ſelf when thou art come into the hand of thy Friend: go humble thy ſelf, and make ſure thy Friend; Give not ſleep to thine eyes, nor ſlumber to thine eye-lids. Deliver thy ſelf as a Roe from the hand of the Hunter, and as a Bird from the hand of the Fowler.* Sir, I am aſſur'd, by your book, that you are fallen into a ſnare, yea, into more ſnares than one, and have cauſe to think of the Apoſtles words, 2 *Tim.* 3. 6, 7. I beſeech you, Sir, by Prayer, and Watchfulneſs, and other good means, haſten out of it, as faſt as you can. May what I have written in this Preface, or rather what you may read in the enſuing diſcourſe, becauſe in that are fewer reflections, and more Arguments, any wayes help to recover you out of that Pit into which you are fallen, I ſhall much rejoyce in the thoughts of what St. *James* ſaith, *Chap.* 5. *v.* 19, & 20. *Brethren, if any of*

you

you do err from the Faith, and one Convert him, Let him know that he which Converteth a sinner from the Errour of his way, shall save a Soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.

7) 324578645 (46368371
7
David
Richard
324578645

9) 789843 21 (877635
9
21

Postscript.

A

POSTSCRIPT.

SIR,

THis *Prefatory* Character *of your Book is not* (*as you ſee*) *an intire Anſwer to all the matters therein contained,* (*though it be to ſeveral of them*) *but is concern'd as much or more about the mode, or manner of your writing, which I doubt not but you have heard with both your ears, has been exceſſively provoking. You are therefore hereafter to expect a Treatiſe againſt your Book, by the name of* A Vindication of ſome of the greateſt Fundamental Doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion, conſtantly owned ever ſince the Reformation from Popery, by the Church of *England, in the* Articles, *and* Homilies *of the ſaid Church,*

and

and in the writings of their moſt eminent Divines, *both* Biſhops, *and others; againſt the great miſtakes of Mr.* W. Sh. *in his book called* &c.

For your ſelf, or any other perſon, acting from, by, or under you, to prevent the coming forth of what is yet behind, were ſuch a piece of Cowardize (*for looking upon your Book as a* Challenge *to all Diſſentors from you in opinion, and daring of them to contradict what you have ſo poſitively, and magiſterially aſſerted, I think that word ſuitable to the caſe in hand*) Diſingenuity, *and palpable* Injuſtice, *as the Son of ſo worthy a Father as your ſelf hath* (*for whoſe ſake I am grieved to write what I do againſt you*) *cannot, or will not be guilty of.*

You are like to find your ſelf very modeſtly, and calmly dealt with in that Diſcourſe, and to be treated with ſoft words, though as hard Arguments as I can uſe. Only you muſt give me leave in that book to ſhew you how B. Andrews, B. Abbot, B. Davenant, B. Downam, B. Hall, B. Prideaux, B. Morton, B. Edwin, (*the then Biſhop of* London (*who has put a Commendatory Preface before* Luthers *Commentary upon the* Galatians, *in which the Doctrine of* Imputed Righteouſneſs, *which you deny, and of Juſtification by Faith*

Faith alone, without works, is higly asſerted) *B.* Uſher *the Primate of* Ireland, *have all, in terms aſſerted, that great Truth, which you have not only denyed, but derided. I am no Herrald to place them in their order, but I obſerve their number,* viz. *that after your* ſeven Presbyters (*if I may ſo call Doctor* Jacomb, *and the reſt*) *you have taken nine* Biſhops *to task, that I have nam'd, beſides perhaps many more that I do not think of at the preſent: I muſt tell you alſo that that great Champion of the Church of* England, viz. *Mr.* Hooker, *in his Treatiſe of Juſtification, is as point blank againſt you, as ever man could be. To theſe I could add, I believe, neer upon forty Divines, Domeſtick, and Foreign, of great note in the Church of God, whoſe Writings do perfectly contradict you, or you them.*

I am not without hope, by the bleſſing of God, to bring you to a better underſtanding of the great Doctrine of Juſtification, than yet *you have, calmly, and as ſtrongly as I can, debating that point with you, as alſo* Communion with God, Acquaintance with Chriſt, *and ſome other things.*

Sir, *Had I not found more trouble in getting delivered of my Book at the Preſs, than*

than in all the time I went with it, or was, as it were breeding of it, you might possibly have seen an answer to every considerable mistake in your Book, by Lady-day *last, and shall, God willing, with all expedition, if you will but say, That if I have any thing to say to you, the Press is open. As to matter of Reflection, I do assure you the heat is over, and I have pretty well done answering you in your kind, as to that part of your folly, nor had I ever begun it, or done any such thing, but that you came forth, as if you had had a Commission (which I dare say was never given you) to run down the Generation of Scrupeling men, with utmost scorn; but wilst any body will do so, it will always be found that though you take them for worms, they are such as will turn again.* Scorn *is a thing that I can ill afford either to* give, *or* take; *I mean, to give when it is not first given, or to take when it is, and I think most mortals have the same infirmity. To direct you how to mend the matter next time, let me recommend to you two passages, one in a book entiled,* Of Education, *p.* 248. Those who take pleasure in exposing others to contempt and derision by jeering and mocking them, avoid, as you would the heels of a horse, that kicks every one he can reach. Indeed there is no greater enemy to peace, and cha-

rity

rity than the Railleur; For as ordinarily it is the ſooty Oven that mocks the black Chimney, ſo one jeer ſeldome goes forth but it returns with its equal, and they together beget a *quarrel*. To abuſe *Inferiours* argues a mean, and contemptible ſpirit; Superiours is dangerous, and a *word* often provokes more than an *action*, &c. *The laſt paſſage I ſhall now trouble you with is in an ingenious book* (*ſuppoſed to be the* Earl of *Clarendine's*, ſometimes Lord Chancellour of *England*) *p.* 5. *and it is this.* Methinks grave, and ſerious men, or they who ought to be grave and ſerious, ſhould be afraid of imitating ſuch Adverſaries, *viz.* men of pert Buffoonry, *for theſe he ſpake of* p. 4.) in their licence, and exceſſes, leſt they ſhould get into a ſcoffing vein, which they ſhould not eaſily ſhake off, or loſe their credit with worthy men, for diſhonoring the cauſe they maintain Ironically.

Appendix.

FOR their ſakes who demand, or deſire the Authority of Men of great name in the Church of God, to ratifie ſuch great Truths as have been, and are controverted amongſt learned men, I ſhall in the Cloſe of this ſhort *Prodromus*, give you the declared judgment of two as Renowned for their Parts, and Learning, as moſt Miniſters that the Church of *England* (not inferiour to any Church in the world for eminent Divines) either hath, or ever had, *viz.* Mr. *Hooker*, Author of the *Eccleſiaſtecal Policy in Folio*, and Dr. *Hammond*. I ſay I ſhall give you ſome taſte of Mr. *Hooker's* judgment concerning *Imputed Righteouſneſs* (ſo much decried by Mr. *Sherlock*) and of Dr. *Hammond's* concerning Chriſt's *Suretiſhip* about which Mr. *Sherlock* doth endleſsly carp, and quibble upon Dr. *Jacomb*. To begin with Mr. *Hooker*, In his Diſcourſe of Juſtification, *p.* 2. he hath theſe words. *If one have died for all then all were dead*

in ſin, all ſinful therefore, none abſolutely Righteous in themſelves, but we are abſolutely Righteous in Chriſt. The Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified (ſaith he in the ſame page) *is perfect.* And p. 4. (alias 38. as it is there counted) the ſame Author ſaith, *But the Righteouſneſs wherein we muſt be found if we will be juſtified is not our own, therefore we cannot be juſtified by any inherent quality. Yet even the man which is in himſelf full of ſin him being found in Chriſt through faith, and having his ſin remitted through Repentance, him God upholdeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his ſin by not imputing, and accepteth him in Jeſus Chriſt as perfectly Righteons as if he had fulfilled all that was commanded him in the Law, ſhall I ſay more perfectly Righteous than if himſelf had fulfilled the whole Law? I muſt take heed what I ſay, but the Apoſtle ſaith,* 2 Cor. 5. 21. *That we might be made the Righteouſneſs of God in him, Such we are in the ſight of God the Father, as is the very Son of God himſelf.* Mr. *Hooker* goes on, and ſaith, p. 5. (alias 39.) *There is no mans caſe ſo dangerous, as his whom Sathan hath perſwaded that his own Righteouſneſs ſhall preſent him pure and blameleſs in the ſight of God.* And in p. 6, (alias 46.) *As for ſuch as hold with the Church of* Rome *that we cannot be ſaved by Chriſt alone without works they do not only by a Circle of Conſequence, but directly deny the foundation of Faith, they hold it not, no, not ſo much as by a thread.* And p. 7. (or 47.) *We have already ſhewed you that there be two kinds of Righteouſneſs, the one without us, which we have by Imputation, the other in us which conſiſteth of*

Faith,

Faith, Hope, and Charity, and other Chriſtian virtues God giveth us the one Juſtice and the other, the one by accepting us for Righteous in Chriſt, the other by working Chriſtian Righteouſneſs in us. In p. 8. (or 48.) he further ſaith, *We ſee by daily experience in a number even of them (viz. Papiſts) when the hour of death approacheth the memory of their own deeds is loathſome to them, they forſake all things wherein they have put any truſt or confidence, no ſtaff to lean upon (but will Mr.* Hooker *ſpeak of leaning and reſting?) no eaſe, no reſt, no comfort then, but only in Jeſus Chriſt.* In the Margent of the ſame page he tells us, that, Pighius *though he dyed Popiſh, yet denied Popery in the Article of Juſtification by works long before his death.* God grant Mr. *Sherlock* may do ſo too, or elſe he will dye but a miſerable Proteſtant. Thus far that highly and worthily admired man, Mr. *Hooker*, with, and according to whom I hope it ſhall alwayes be as ſafe for me to write, as for any man to write for the contrary. Now as to the buſineſs of *Suretiſhip* in reference to which word, and thing, Mr. *Sherlock* playes as many tricks with Dr. *Jacomb*, I had almoſt ſaid as a Dancing Bear, and glorieth over him (about p. 288. and ſo onwards) let me deſire him to check his own inſolence by conſidering one paſſage in Dr. *Hammond*'s Catechiſm, *viz.* the laſt Queſtion or Anſwer but one in that book, the words whereof are theſe. Q. *How was the pardon of ſin purchaſed?* A. *You have oft heard by the Satisfaction wrought by him in his ſufferings taking upon him to be our* Surety, *and*

to

suffer in our stead, that as many as are renewed by his grace, may be released by his sufferings, and from hence thereto results the consummation of our hope, everlasting bliss in another World.

Reader,

Having observ'd that *Friends* do easily pardon Typographical Errours, and candidly guess at the Sense, and that an *Enemy*, will over-look the Table of *Errata*, that he may charge the Printer's oversights upon the Author (which is very unjust) I have not troubled my self with a full Index of such Errors as I have observed in the Printing of this Book, but only Corrected a few as followeth.

Page 1. Line ult. *word*, read *world*. p. 3. *part*, r. *put asunder*. p. 3. r. *have contemn'd*. p. 4. for *back'd it with*, r. *back'd with*. p. 7. r. *proposition*. p. 38. r. *complaining*. p. 89. r. *unchurching*.

FINIS.